pointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Conway, Blair P.
Crew, Randolph E.
Mitzel, Michael F.
Haskins, Steven W.
Lovely, Francis B., Jr.
Delones, Robert C.

The following-named (U.S. Military Academy graduate) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Elizey, Michael B.

La Jon R. Hutton for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant and temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the U.S. Marine Corps, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named (meritorious noncommissioned officer) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Schillinger, Charles W.
Trout, Benjamin H., II

The following-named (staff noncommissioned officer) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Moe, Robert E.

The following-named (commissioned warrant officers/warrant officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps for limited duty, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Brewer, Patrick R.
Clark, Adrian L.
Conner, Gerald H.
Cook, Loy E.
Costlow, Walter E.
Darrow, Marvin L.
Flournoy, William E.
Groom, Robert W.
Johnson, Stephen J., Jr.
Keil, Richard L.
Knox, Charles, Jr.
Ludwig, Robert M.
McCarthy, William J.
Moody, John E.
Reeder, Edmond W.
Riley, Martin J., Jr.
Rowe, Clark H.
Russell, Robert H.
Smith, Lake Jr.
Woodson, Duane L.

The following-named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps for limited duty, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Alvarez, Robert L.
Bare, Harry E.
Boudreaux, Ervin J.
Bounds, Jack B.
Carson, Edgar M.
Carver, Richard J.
Cecchetti, Mario E.
De Long, Samuel T. J.
Dominguez, Joe
Dunacusky, Joseph G., Jr.
Durie, Charles W.
Frye, Harold E., Jr.
Gordon, Donald E.
Gravenor, Randall W.
Hawbaker, Lowell D.
Hicks, Grady L.
Johnson, George H., Jr.
Jukoski, Alexander P.
Juneau, John E.
Lambert, Carl E.
Lemieux, Joseph R. E. N.
Lewis, Fred M.
Libby, Frederick A.
Lippe, Ralph
Maxik, Bernard J.
McGuire, Donald E.
McLaughlin, Richard S.
Meads, Walter S., Jr.
Owens, James E.
Raub, Leonard D.
Reffelt, Edwin L.
Ripperger, Robert K.
Rogers, Joe G.
Sanfratello, Johnie A.
Scarangello, Anthony F.
Scott, James P.
Stabile, Anthony D.

The following-named (U.S. Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefore as provided by law:

Anderson, Timothy J.
Artmann, Rufus A., Jr.
Bacon, Paul C.
Baker, David L.
Barber, John C.
Beaty, David C.
Boivin, John A.
Brahmstadt, Clifford A.
Brookes, Richard C.
Buchli, James F.
Campbell, James C.
Carver, Howard C., III
Cathey, Michael R.
Charles, Roger G.
Christian, Leslie A.
Clatworthy, Raymond J., III
Cornetta, Ronald J.
Culver, William L.
Delong, Michael P.
Donnelly, William R., Jr.
Earl, Robert L.
Ehmer, James S.
Eisenbach, Charles R., II
Ellis, Dalton R., Jr.
Etter, William P., II
Foresman, James L.
Foulkes, Richard R.
Glynn, Daniel M.
Goebel, James A.
Goodwin, William G.
Gordon, Adrian J.
Hapke, Norman F., Jr.
Hart, John T.
Heely, Edwin D.
Heinemeyer, Klaus Peter
Hepp, Edward J., Jr.
Holihan, Robert J.
Holtzclaw, Gary E.
Howard, Patrick G.
Hudson, Richard B.
Isbell, Robert P.
Isbell, William P.
Johnson, Russell L.
Kalish, William R.
Kettner, Alan A.
Kieffer, John A., Jr.
Kunkel, Richard H., Jr.
Langston, Michael D.
Lewis, Edward G.
Lister, Dennis L.
Matus, John F.
McConnell, Paul R.
McCormack, Orval W.
McKee, Donald S.
McNeece, James R.
Meltzer, Max C.
Millen, John C.
Mills, Edward H.
Morgan, Michael D. L.
Nelson, William J., Jr.
OBrien, John J., Jr.
ORourke, Robert J.
Pace, Peter
Philip, George, III
Pruiett, Ronald E.
Ptack, Kenneth R.
Robitaille, Joseph A., Jr.
Roll, Raymond A.
Roth, Michael G.
Samaras, George N.
Scivicque, Richard S.
Selden, Jules B.
Shaw, Dennis R.
Sheahan, William J., III
Shields, Michael F.
Slough, John J.
Stoll, Ronald M.
Toppelberg, Alan S.
Trompeter, Thomas R.
Tuttle, Robert E.
Vetter, David A.
Weiss, Thomas J.
Wilkerson, Thomas L.
Williams, Michael J.
Williamson, John T.
Wright, Henry A.
Zahn, George A., Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Acly, Peter A.
Alexander, William S.
Allen, Joe E.
Anderson, Gary K.
Anuszewski, John W.
Ashman, John W.
Bank, John D.
Barnes, Robert C., Jr.
Beeler, Park L., II
Begun, Lawrence C.
Bently, Jon R.
Black, William R.
Boillot, David A.
Bradstreet, Bernard F.
Brodrick, Steven P.
Brown, David T.
Broz, Charles F.
Budd, Paul D.
Burton, Ronald L.
Buechler, Robert J.
Calderas:, John, Jr.
Champe, Charles R.
Colt, Peter L.
Connor, Michael C.
Cooper, C. Richard, Jr.
Cress, John R.
Daigle, Paul R.
Dakin, William E., Jr.
Dalia, George C., Jr.
Davis, Crane
Davis, William P., II
Decker, Andrew P.
Deggendorf, Terrence T.
Devylder, Edgar P., Jr.
Doyle, Kevin M.
Dunn, Charles C.
Eckenrode, David J.
Engelman, Robert A.
Ertwine, Carl H.
Ewing, James J., Jr.
Faro, David R.
Feltner, Jonathan P.
Ferguson, Michael J.
Finneran, Patrick J., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Kenneth W
Freiherr, Stephen P.
Friese, William P.
Fuller, James R.
Gazdayka, John R.
Gernert, Royce G.
Gettman, James A.
Gibson, Carl R.
Gingrich, David M.
Goslin, Gary J.
Graves, Terrence C.
Greenfield, Charles A.
Grischkowsky, Roger S
Gustafson, Grant P.
Hadar, Steven P.
Hagan, John R.
Hager, Hampton C., Jr.
Hansen, Robert W.
Harrington, Patrick J.
Haughey, David W.
Hayes, John E.
Henry, Floyd P.
Higgins, William R.
Holmes, Michael
Howe, Dennis K.
Hudock, John M., Jr.
Huntington, Frederick L.
Hutchinson, Robert H.
Ingram, Thomas M.
Jackson, Charles B.
James, Albert E., Jr.
Jones, Stuart C.
Kadolph, Harold D.
Karch, John F.
Kehrli, Bruce A.
Kirkpatrick, William J
Knestrick, Martin E.
Kuhrtz, Steven G.
Kurth, Richard C.
Kuzniewski, Gregory S.
Kyle, Albert S.
Lancaster, John A.
Lawson, John F.
Lewis, James T.
Linkous, Harry A., III
Lipson, Merek E.
List, Robert W.
Lloyd, Robert M.
Lovett, Connie B.
Lyman, Donald R.
Macknis, John F.
March, Donald F.
Masters, John H., Jr.
McAtee, Keith C.
McCarver, Dennis M.
McGaughey, George L., Jr.
Metli, Richard
Morrow, Michael K.
Moyher, Cyril V.
Munyon, William H.
Murphy, Edward J.
Narney, John K.
Neal, Richard O.
Nelson, Jan H.
Nelson, Robert R.
Newlin, Robert B.
Nickerson, Douglas W.
Norton, Raymond J.
Nyderek, Joseph M.
O'Shaughnessy, Edward M., Jr.
Oswald, Edwin L.
Packard, Robert A., Jr.
Parker, Paul D., II.
Peake, David B.
Pearson, Thomas R., Jr.
Peterson, Paul W.
Polnaszek, David A.
Pribbenow, Merle L.
Radcliffe, Harry Q.
Randall, David S., Jr.
Reed, Nathaniel H.
Reilly, Thomas L.
Renaghan, Joseph F.
Roberson, Larry E.
Roepke, Craig S.
Rowen, Charles G.
Sammons, Jack L., Jr.
Sanborn, James C.
Sandberg, Michael B.
Scheer, Donald A.
Schmid, John A.
Schroeder, Karl R.
Seagraves, James F.
Shaw, Stephen C.
Smaldone, Joseph P.
Smith, Clinton A.
Smith, Michael D.
Snocker, Frederick G.
Steel, Charles
Stephien, Edward R.
Steury, Jack E.
Stocker, Norman R.
Sullivan, John J., Jr.
Sute, John R.
Tait, Robert, Jr.
Tarbet, Dale M.
Taylor, Joseph Z.
Tehan, William J.
Terry, Joseph B.
Titcomb, Warren S.
Toeniskoetter, Charles J.
Toyama, Thompson R. T.
Tritsch, John B.
Tucker, Courtney L.
Ulrich, Carl W.
Waller, Robert W.
Warford, Charles F., Jr.
Warren, Clifford B., III.
Weir, David E.
Welsh, Joseph R., Jr.
Williams, James G.
Wilson, Bruce B.
Wojtasek, James D.
Wolfe, Charles E., Jr.
Wroblewski, Ronald J. P.
Wzorek, James F.
Zimmerman, Jeffrey M.

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Rogers, Robert D.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 21, 1967:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Jonathan Davis, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1973.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate, April 21, 1967:

POSTMASTER

Anne C. Freeman to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the State of Connecticut.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.—Psalm 23: 3.

Eternal God, our Father, whose love never lets us go, whose patience never lets us down, and whose justice never lets

us off, hear us again as we offer unto Thee our morning prayer. We come out of a sense of need, out of a conviction that Thou art with us, and we would find our confidence and our courage in the support of Thy sustaining strength.

We pray for light upon our way, love along our path, and life amid the daily duties of our demanding day. Center our lives and the lives of our people around faith rather than fear, around justice rather than injustice, and around high principles rather than low prejudices. Strengthen us where we are weak, hold us firm when we would fall, steady us when we start to slip, and lift us up when down we go.

Remind us of the integrity which has undergirded our Nation, the freedom which is our rich heritage, and of our faith in Thee which has made and still makes our Nation great and strong. Lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 20, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON APRIL 28, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Friday, April 28, 1967, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting Gen. William C. Westmoreland, U.S. Army, commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ACT OF JUNE 30, 1954, AS AMENDED, PROVIDING FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

CONGRESS SHOULD STEP UP PROGRAMS FOR WATER AND SEWAGE FACILITIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to increase the authorization for basic water and sewage facilities from $200 million to $1 billion. This new authorization would become effective in the next fiscal year, beginning July 1.

Mr. Speaker, this new authorization would provide funds for programs under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. This section authorized the Department of Housing and Urban Development to make grants up to 50 percent of the cost of water and sewage facilities in cities of more than 10,000 population. This section also authorized HUD to make grants up to 90 percent for such facilities in towns of less than 10,000 population.

The development needs of our cities, small towns, and rural areas are critical. Certainly the existence of good basic water and sewage plants and related facilities are essential if these development programs are to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest backlogs of public need is in this area. This has been a growing development gap and one which our cities and small towns have been unable to close. The situation was heightened in 1966 when high interest rates and tight money prevented many municipalities from voting and selling bonds for the construction of water and sewage plants.

As a result, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has a backlog of about $4 billion in requests for grants for this type of facility. At present, authorizations would allow appropriations of only $200 million for fiscal year 1968, beginning on July 1. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this authorization is much too small to make any meaningful dent in this backlog.

Outlays for water and sewage facilities require tremendous blocks of capital which local governments are simply unable to find. As a result, other development programs, such as housing, industrial expansion, urban and rural development, and other similar programs are deferred or canceled. The enactment of a meaningful program of Federal grants for water and sewage facilities will unlock local initiative in these other development areas and move the country forward.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the $1 billion authorization which I propose will be paid back to the country many times over as a result of new activity which these facilities will create.

EXPRESSION OF SORROW OVER LOSS OF RUSSIAN COSMONAUT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, as I am sure is true of all Americans, share the sorrow of the Russian people caused by the loss of one of their cosmonauts this morning.

The Russians have a good space program, and we have a good space program, but so long as we deal so much in the unknown we will have more accidents. I am very thankful that we have brave men who will risk their lives to improve the lot of mankind, be they Russians, Americans, or whoever they are.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] in his expression of sorrow over the death of one of Russia's brave pioneers of space. The gentleman from Texas is a very active and important member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and chairman of both the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight and Space Oversight. When he speaks, he speaks the sentiments of all those in Congress interested in the exploration of outer space. He also expresses the sentiments, I am sure, of all Americans when he says we join the people of Russia in their bereavement over the death of one of their bravest sons. Like our own astronauts, the Russian cosmonauts are blazing new trails. They are the heroes of the skies and when one of them falls, the whole world mourns. I am sure I speak the sentiments of all Members of the House when I say we extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to the widow and children of Cosmonaut Komarov in their time of sadness.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3399) to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the bill provides $20,500 for continuation of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct, for 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. May I have the assurance of the gentleman from Wisconsin that this will be the end of the Commission, by the end of November of 1968?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman has that assurance.

Mr. GROSS. And the end of expenditures for this purpose?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3399

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of Public Law 88–240 (77 Stat. 477) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission shall cease to exist upon completion of the construction authorized by this Act, or on November 6, 1968, whichever shall first occur."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3399 simply extends the life of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission from May 6, 1967 to November 6, 1968.

This bill was passed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 20, 1967, and has been placed on the Consent Calendar for May 1, 1967. This is uncomfortably close to the May 6, 1967 expiration date. Therefore, the reason I am asking unanimous consent to bring H.R. 3399 up at this time is to allow sufficient time for legislative action in the Senate. This additional week should prevent the life of the Commission from expiring while legislative action is being completed in the House and in the Senate.

As explained in the report accompanying this bill, the construction of the memorial authorized by Public Law 88–240 has been delayed because the United States was unable to obtain reasonable bids in March 1966. It was necessary to rebid the construction and a contract has now been awarded.

The Department of State has strongly urged that this Commission not be allowed to die before it fulfills its task. To do so might be a matter of embarrassment to the United States and the Philippines, as well as grounds for a possible misunderstanding. The Commission's Philippine counterpart is continuing to function and should have a single point of contact with the United States to resolve the numerous problems that will arise during the construction now underway.

The total additional cost for operating this Commission during the remainder of the extended period covered by this bill is estimated at $20,500.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 3399.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3399, which will extend the life of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission for an additional period of about 20 months, to November 6, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the continuation of this Commission, in my view, is extremely important because the memorial which was authorized by Public Law 88–240 is now under construction, and it is essential that there be a focal point, which this Commission represents, for clearing the various problems that always arise during construction periods.

This Commission was created by an act of Congress in 1953 with the assigned function of cooperating with the Philippine Government in planning a memorial on Corregidor that would be a fitting tribute to the sacrifices of the Americans and Filipinos who fought there and on Bataan. A companion Commission, known as the Philippines National Shrines Commission, was created by the Philippine Government.

The plans for the memorial that finally evolved from the work of these two Commissions was a modest proposal that it is estimated will cost the United States approximately $1,500,000. Under these plans, Corregidor will be transformed from the state of ruin into which it had fallen to a simple but dignified memorial area comparable to Saratoga or Gettysburg. The site will be consecrated ground. Other improvements will include the erection of historical markers, the restoration of sites such as the famous Malinta Tunnel, the repair of roads, the installation of facilities for electricity and water, and a small pavilion that will serve as a tourist center, house an auditorium and serve as a repository for historical documents. Twin flagpoles will be erected at the highest point on the island from which flags of both countries would fly and be illuminated at night. The Philippine Government is prepared to accept its share of responsibility including arrangements for guards, for adequate transportation to the island, and for collaboration with the United States in the production of a documentary film that will put in perspective the story of Corregidor.

In the initial request for bids in March 1966, the Commission was unable to obtain a response within the available funds. The process of rebidding the construction of the proposed memorial has delayed it for about 1 year, which is the primary reason for the request for the extension of the Commission's life. I have been a member of the Commission almost since its inception. Therefore, I am aware of the unavoidable delays and the efforts on the part of the Commission to move this memorial construction along as rapidly as possible.

I do not believe that the Commission should be allowed to expire before the functions assigned it by the Congress have been completed and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the approval of H.R. 3399.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks, that the gentleman from Alabama may extend his remarks, and that any other Member who so desires may extend his remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE OIL POLLUTION ACT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, recently it was revealed that the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 is partially unenforceable.

This law—which went into effect last November—was meant to strengthen the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, by imposing more stringent penalties on violators.

The Oil Pollution Act was confounded by this amendment, however, as it limited its enforcement to cases where the offender was "willfully or grossly negligent" in discharging oil.

As a result, it has now been discovered, attorneys of the Justice Department have not filed even one case against owners of ships that were oil pollution violators since the Clean Water Act became effective 5 months ago.

The situation is both unintended and regrettable.

The 1924 law actually was more effective before the 1966 Clean Water Act was passed. In its original state, the Justice Department had only to prove that a discharge of oil came from a certain ship and then the shipowner could only avoid prosecution by proving in turn that the escaped oil resulted from an accident or was an emergency.

When the Oil Pollution Act was amended last year, it was not the intent of Congress to weaken the enforcement provisions of the act, and I am today introducing legislation to remedy this unintended result.

My amendment is intended to repair enforcement difficulties of the Clean Water Act, and would forbid any careless or accidental discharge of oil into navigable waters. The Clean Water Act was intended to do this in the first place.

I propose this amendment at a time when the whole country is aware of the damage oil discharged into navigable waters can cause—when the recent *Torrey Canyon* disaster and the Cape Cod oil slick are foremost in our minds.

In my home area of Buffalo, N.Y., an oil slick has jeopardized both Buffalo Harbor and the Niagara River.

I hope the 90th Congress will recognize the urgency involved in passing this bill, or one like it.

Certainly I know it was not the intention of this House or the other body to weaken the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act. To remedy this defect I have today introduced legislation, and I hope we can consider it at this session.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will be glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GARMATZ. I might say as far as oil pollution is concerned, there is a meeting in London on May 4 and 5 of the IMCO, which is the International Maritime Consultants Organization. Our committee will have a representative over there to see what is going on and follow the meetings right on through.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EMERGENCY STRIKE LEGISLATION NEEDED

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I want again to address the House on the problem of emergency strike legislation. The possibilities of a national railway strike now, or a trucking or airline strike at other times, are almost too frightening to consider, but nevertheless we have got a railroad dispute staring us in the face.

The news media this past weekend carried reports that negotiators mediating the railroad dispute have reached an impasse.

It seems to me that Congress will again be faced with the problem that came before it less than 2 weeks ago, and frankly, not to squarely face this problem would be less than responsible.

What concerns me now is the fact that, in light of recent labor disputes in both the trucking and railroad industries, there has been some harsh legislation introduced. I do not wish to indict the persons supporting any of the approaches I am going to mention because I believe everyone here has dealt with this problem in good faith. But at the same time, I am convinced that many of the approaches recommended destroy collective bargaining and the entire framework of our national labor policy.

The railroad dispute will quite possibly rear its head again early next month. I am hopeful that it can be settled by the parties involved. However, I am fearful that if it is not settled, some of the solutions recommended in pending legislation will be grabbed in desperation and enacted as permanent laws. The railway dispute is too much upon us to be dealt with on anything other than an ad hoc basis.

Many of you are familiar with my bill, H.R. 5638. I have spoken of it to you from this floor, and I have been in correspondence with all of you on the subject. I know that the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee are fully aware of the bill.

Even so, I am shocked that we, the Congress, have quietly wallowed in our lackluster vacuum and let the problem grow to crisis proportion.

I would be less than honest to try to tell you that we are solely responsible for a labor policy that brings nearly every transportation dispute to the Halls for settlement. The executive department, by its inaction to propose any guidelines for new laws that could deal with strikes that threaten to cripple the country, has become our "partner in sin" in this matter.

This foot dragging should not be allowed to continue, and I call upon the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to schedule immediate hearings on legislation designed to correct these abuses.

It is surprising and shocking to realize that nothing has been done and, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I believe the time is running out.

I do know that the able chairman of the Commerce Committee has told me that hearings would be set if no settlement is made in the railway strike and the issue is returned to Congress.

But, no matter whether this particular dispute is resolved or not, the basic problem will still be with us. This is reason enough to give our attention to considering a well-thought-out and reasonable course of action.

I realize full well the complexities and technicalities of this matter. This is no legitimate reason to simply agonize and hope the problem will go away.

The problem will not vanish like so much grease on a shirt when bleach is added to the wash water. It is going to take the kind of action that only this legislative body can give it.

Everyone in this Congress knows that our Commerce Committee chairman is a fair and courageous American, and that he will give all sides a good and fair chance to present their case. But we have got to get with it. The hour is late and the public interest demands it.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to review the provisions of my bill in order to show how it is the only type of approach which will preserve the cornerstone of collective bargaining and present a workable solution to crippling strikes.

The bill amends section 10 of the Railway Labor Act. It preserves the present process up to and including the Federal Mediation Board.

As is the case now, the Mediation Board is empowered to give notification to the President if a dispute between a carrier and its employees is not adjusted under earlier provisions of the act, and, if in the judgment of the Board, such a dispute "threatens substantially to interrupt interstate or foreign commerce to a degree as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation."

At this point, my proposal would add new procedures to deal with whatever problem arises.

After receiving notification from the Mediation Board, the President would have the discretion to take either of two approaches:

He could appoint a nonbinding Emergency Board with powers virtually identical to those given the Emergency Board under present law or he could announce his intention to establish a binding arbitration board, termed a Special Board.

If, at this stage, the President elects to appoint an Emergency Board, he may appoint as many disinterested individuals to the Emergency Board as he deems desirable and necessary. The President may, also, in his discretion, charge the Emergency Board with the responsibility to make a statement of the facts of the dispute and/or recommendations for the settlement of any or all of the matters in dispute.

Within 60 days after the appointment of the Emergency Board, or such date as he may specify—but not to exceed 60 additional days—if the dispute has not been settled, the Board shall report to the President, and for 30 days after this report is made, there will be a 30-day cooling-off period during which there will be no change, except by mutual agreement, in the working conditions out of which the dispute arose.

After this cooling-off period, the President may exercise any or all, or none of three alternatives:

First. He may transmit the report of the Emergency Board to Congress for such action as he may recommend.

Second. If the report includes recommendations for settlement, the President may provide by executive order that these recommendations shall serve as the working conditions for a period not to exceed 120 days.

Third. He may notify the parties of his intention to establish a Special Board.

I may note at this point that the Special Board I just mentioned can be initiated by the President immediately after the notification by the Mediation Board and its procedures have been utilized.

At whichever point the President announces his intent to establish a Special Board—if he ever does decide to do so—the parties have 10 days from the announcement to select members of a Special Board which will have authority to make a final and binding determination of matters in dispute. The parties may also establish procedures for the Board, and ascertain the matters in dispute which shall be determined by the Board.

If the parties fail to establish the Special Board, the President shall appoint three members of the Board, one member shall be appointed by the representatives of the employees and one shall be appointed by the carriers involved. In reaching its determination, the Special Board may, in its discretion, adopt the recommendations of the Emergency Board, and shall take into consideration all relevant information surrounding the dispute.

The Special Board would make and publish its determination within 60 days after its appointment except that the President may extend the period for not more than an additional 60 days. With certain exceptions, the determination of a Special Board would be final and binding upon the parties for the period described by the Special Board, as long as the period does not exceed 2 years. The decision of the Special Board shall be enforceable by proceedings in the U.S. district courts.

The determination of a Special Board may be set aside only by application of a party to the Board proceedings, and only on the grounds that the determination was based on fraud or corruption, or was not in accordance with section 10 of the act or with the Constitution. In no event would the reviewing court have jurisdiction to review or set aside a determination of a Special Board on the ground that rates of pay, rules, or working conditions prescribed were not just and reasonable.

Now let us look at the alternatives available. The easiest answer here is to do nothing. If we allowed the present law to stand, Congress would continue to be brought into every serious dispute, and in light of the growing complexity of our society, I know they will be successively more difficult.

That is not the problem, though. The problem is that collective bargaining would be the innocent and invariable

victim of such action. If the parties feel that congressional intervention is the final step in every serious nationwide labor dispute, then all efforts at bargaining will lapse, and the parties will concentrate their efforts in lobbying pressure.

Another suggested approach is that of "finality." Under this scheme, compulsory arbitration would be keyed in at the end of every process of negotiation and mediation. In other words, it would be a procedure unquestionably at the end of the line whenever there is a bargaining standoff in a serious dispute.

Under this plan, I feel the parties would lose their incentive to bargain. Possibly at least one of the parties would feel that they would get a more favorable result under arbitration and accordingly, they would not be truly interested in bargaining prior to arbitration.

As Secretary Wirtz has said on this point, compulsory arbitration not only eliminates strikes, it also eliminates bargaining. Furthermore, I feel that the choice of only one abrupt remedy to cover the tremendous scope of disputes is inadequate.

Many of these same objections apply to the plan to create a permanent labor-management court. Once the jurisdiction of the court is invoked, I feel that the parties would be removed from the bargaining arena and that a voluntary settlement would be most unlikely.

In light of these proposed alternatives, I restate my firm conviction that the need is for further procedures which enable continued bargaining in an atmosphere conductive to good-faith negotiation, which give the President a choice of procedures and allows him to tailor the remedy to fit the situation, and finally which secludes the nature and even the existence of that ultimate step of governmental intervention which would conclusively settle the dispute.

President Johnson has said to negotiators that the public occupies a third seat at the bargaining table. I think it is time the law took cognizance of that fact.

The power to act in serious disputes must lie somewhere. I think that responsibility should rest in the Chief Executive. I am aware of the argument that a Presidential choice of procedures might cause the parties to neglect bargaining with each other, directing pressures on the White House on which route to select. In light of all the circumstances, I think this argument is without merit. I realize that there are weaknesses to this approach, but I submit that the alternatives are much worse.

It should be remembered, however, that the President does not shoulder this responsibility alone. He may make the choice to take direct action by Executive order or he may refer it to the Mediation Board or the Special Board. He can also refer disputes to Congress for whatever action this body thinks best.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoin upon this body the need for our active consideration and participation in arriving at a workable solution to this vexing problem.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman from Texas is bringing up a very important matter and something which is of great concern to all of us. I remember and remind the gentleman that a year ago the President in his state of the Union message told us he would send up legislation on this. We have been sitting here and waiting for it ever since. I am not sure that it is a matter for the committee, because we have been waiting here for the President to send this legislation up.

Mr. PICKLE. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois the fact that they have not submitted a report is simply an indication that this is a highly technical and involved matter. I understand they will have a report out in the next week or two. I hope it is true. There has been foot dragging but the fact that there has been foot dragging down the street does not mean there has to be any more here. You and I must shoulder the responsibility, too, I will say to the gentleman.

BLEAK TIME IN THE HISTORY OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from Texas just said, this is a bleak time in the history of collective bargaining.

President Johnson has reported that his Special Mediation Panel—made up of three distinguished citizens—has developed a reasonable formula which would avert a nationwide railway strike.

But the unions and the carriers have rejected the Panel's proposal. And a crippling shutdown of a major segment of our transportation system is only 8 days away.

The situation that now faces us is not only tragic, but unnecessary as well.

I have observed many wage disputes between labor and management during my years in the House of Representatives. Yet seldom, if ever, have I seen a situation such as this, where both parties are so close to agreement, yet so unwilling to take the last, short step together.

In his message to Congress on April 10, President Johnson stated that:

> The differences which remain in this dispute are important. But they are slight when compared with the price to the country and to these parties from a suspension of rail service.

If that statement was true then, it is doubly true today. The economic and social consequences of such a strike have not lessened. But the differences between the disputing parties have. The President's Special Panel has worked long and diligently, favoring no party but the public interest. The Panel has reported that the parties are not far apart; that:

> The matter is one of dollars and cents alone and the real differences between the parties in our judgment are not great.

In view of this, and in view of the seriousness of the situation, I call upon both labor and management to put aside their differences and consider the national interest as a whole. I call upon them to accept the Panel's reasonable recommendations.

All that is now needed is the will to settle.

That will must be the order of the day.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, President Johnson carried to Europe with him the added burden of a threatened nationwide railway strike.

The President is to be commended for the tireless efforts that he and his Special Mediation Panel have made to avert such a strike. The Panel reports that it has brought labor and management so close together that their differences are now a matter of "dollars and cents." In my opinion, only a thread now separates them.

Yet, as close as they are, both parties have reached an unyielding deadlock, and neither appears willing to give an inch. A strike is only 8 days away.

I sincerely hope that the unions and management can be made to understand that their unreasonable positions are posing a grave threat to the well-being of this Nation.

It is obvious that we cannot afford a strike. It is also obvious, at least to me, that neither of the disputing parties can afford the consequences of bringing such a strike about.

Collective bargaining remains the best way to settle these disputes. And it remains one of the strongest pillars of our free enterprise system.

If both parties will understand this, they will serve not only their Nation's interest, but their own interests as well.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, by request of the executive branch, legislation proposing to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended.

The proposed amendments are necessary in order to enable the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to effect

an orderly disposition of payments arising out of recent claims settlement agreements with Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

In addition the proposed legislation contains provisions which bear on the disposition of the funds remaining in the Italian claims program, and propose various technical changes in the existing statutes.

I should like to mention at this point that during the last Congress, the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs considered similar legislation and reported it with amendments to the full committee.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe I felt that it was incumbent upon me to introduce this new legislation requested by the executive branch. I am doing it today.

The text of the bill being introduced is as follows:

H.R. 9063

A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (f) of section 4, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) No remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission under this title shall exceed 10 per centum of the total amount paid pursuant to any award certified under the provisions of this title, on account of such claim. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, demands or receives, on account of services so rendered, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both."

(2) Subsection (b) of section 7, title I, is amended by inserting "(1)" after the subsection letter, and adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deduct from any amounts covered, subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph, into any special fund, created pursuant to section 8, 5 per centum thereof as reimbursement to the Government of the United States for expenses incurred by the Commission and by the Treasury Department in the administration of this title. The amounts so deducted shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

(3) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c), section 7, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) If any person to whom any payment is to be made pursuant to this title is deceased or is under a legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative, except that if any payment to be made is not over $1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, payment may be made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto, without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law with respect to the administration of estates."

(4) Subsection (c) of section 8, title I, is amended by inserting the phrase ", prior to the date of enactment of the amendment of this paragraph," immediately after the word "covered" and before the word "into", and by inserting "(1)" after the words "section 7(b)" and before the words "of this title."

(5) Section 8, title I, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed out of sums covered, subsequent to the date of enactment of this subsection, into any special fund created pursuant to this section to make payment on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to this title with respect to claims included within the terms of a claims settlement agreement concluded between the Government of the United States and a foreign government as described in subsection (a) of section 4 of this title, as follows and in the following order of priority:

"(1) Payment in the amount of $1,000 or the principal amount of the award, whichever is less;

"(2) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid principal balance of each remaining award which shall bear to such unpaid principal balance the same proportion as the total amount available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid principal balance of all such awards; and

"(3) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid balance of each award of interest which shall bear to such unpaid balance of interest, the same proportion as the total amount available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid balance of interest of all such awards."

(6) Section 302, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cover into each of the Bulgarian and Rumanian Claims Funds, such sums as may be paid by the Government of the respective country pursuant to the terms of any claims settlement agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of such country."

(7) Section 303, title III, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (2), and by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and immediately thereafter, the word, "and".

(8) Section 303, title III, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Pay effective compensation for the nationalization, compulsory liquidation, or other taking of property of nationals of the United States in Bulgaria and Rumania, between August 9, 1955, and the effective date of the claims agreement between the respective country and the United States."

(9) Section 304 of title III is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(b) The Commission shall receive and determine, or redetermine as the case may be, in accordance with applicable substantive law, including international law, the validity and amounts of claims owned by persons who were nationals of the United States on August 9, 1955, which arose out of the war in which Italy was engaged from June 10, 1940 to September 15, 1947, and with respect to which provision was not made in the treaty of peace with Italy: *Provided,* That no awards shall be made to persons who have received compensation in any amount pursuant to subsection (a) of this section or under section 202 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, or to persons whose claims have been denied by the Commission for reasons other than that they were not filed within the time prescribed by section 306.

"(c) The Commission shall receive and determine, or redetermine as the case may be, in accordance with applicable substantive law, including international law, the validity and amounts of claims owned by persons who were nationals of the United States on September 3, 1943, and the date of enactment of this subsection, against the Government of Italy which arose out of the war in which Italy was engaged from June 10, 1940, to September 15, 1947, in territory ceded by Italy pursuant to the treaty of peace with Italy: *Provided,* That no awards shall be made to persons who have received compensation in any amount pursuant to the treaty of peace with Italy or subsection (a) of this section.

"(d) Within thirty days after enactment of this subsection, or within thirty days after the date of enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under subsections (b) and (c) of this section, whichever date is later, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register the time when and the limit of time within which claims may be filed with the Commission, which limit shall not be more than six months after such publication.

"(e) The Commission shall certify awards on claims determined pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of this section to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of remaining balances in the Italian Claims Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 310 of this title, after payment in full of all awards certified pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

"(f) After payment in full of all awards certified to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to subsections (a) and (e) of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer the unobligated balance in the Italian Claims Fund into the War Claims Fund created by section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended."

(10) Section 306, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) Within thirty days after enactment of this subsection or the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, whichever is later, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register the time when and the limit of time within which claims may be filed under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, which limit shall not be more than six months after such publication."

(11) Section 310, title III, is amended by adding at the end of Subsection (a) thereof the following paragraph:

"(6) Whenever the Commission is authorized to settle claims by the enactment of paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title with respect to Rumania and Bulgaria, no further payments shall be authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of section 303 of the Bulgarian or Rumanian Claims Funds, as the case may be, until payments on account of awards certified pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 with respect to such Fund have been authorized in equal proportion to payments previously authorized on existing awards certified pursuant to paragraph (1), (2), and (3) of section 303."

(12) Section 316, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 and subsection (b) and (c) of section

304 of this title not later than two years following the date of enactment of such paragraph, or following the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 and subsections (b) and (c) of section 304 of this title, whichever is later."

TO DESIGNATE APRIL 28–29, 1967, AS "RUSH-BAGOT AGREEMENT DAYS"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (S.J. Res. 49) to designate April 28–29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days," and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] if now, or in the future, it is anticipated that the adoption of this resolution will result in any expenditure on the part of the Federal Government?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that the adoption of this joint resolution does not contemplate the expenditure of any Federal moneys as a result of this celebration.

Mr. GROSS. It does not involve any funds whatsoever?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Iowa will yield further——

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It does not involve any Federal funds whatsoever.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 49

Whereas the Rush-Bagot Agreement was signed on April 28–29, 1817, providing for naval disarmament between Canada and the United States along the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain; and

Whereas this agreement is still in existence one hundred and fifty years later, making it the oldest arms limitation treaty in effect in the world today; and

Whereas Canada and the United States share the longest unfortified boundary in the world as a result of such agreement; and

Whereas the commemoration of the signing of such agreement would serve as a reminder of the lasting friendship between Canada and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating April 28–29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days" and inviting the Governors of the several States and the chief officials of local governments and the people of the United States to observe such days with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX-INCENTIVE DEVELOPMENT ACT TO STRENGTHEN SMALLTOWN AMERICA

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for increased job opportunities and employment—the Tax-Incentive Development Act of 1967—a bill that can mean much to our cities, large and small, by creating employment opportunities in our smaller cities.

Several of my colleagues are also introducing similar bills.

This bill provides tax incentives to induce business to locate in smaller communities—a proposal that has the endorsement of many officials in our Government.

This bill will offer:

An added 7 percent credit, in addition to the investment credit now under suspension—for machinery and equipment investment, and

Accelerated tax amortization of investment in industrial and commercial facilities, including land, over a 60-month period, to industry locating new or branch plants in small town and rural America.

It is my hope that this bill will assist small town and rural areas to develop their resources and their people and provide jobs and employment opportunities to our young people and others who want to live at home.

A recent poll shows that 50 percent of our people want to live in rural America.

Our major cities are caught in a population strangulation—our small towns are caught in a population decimation.

Their problems are interrelated and intertwined.

By providing jobs and opportunities in our small towns, our young people will be encouraged to channel their talent and their creativity into their own communities, rather than into major cities to compete with residents of those cities for jobs.

The Washington Post said in a recent editorial:

The country cannot accept as inevitable the further concentration of rural refugees in its large cities . . . The neglect of this problem is rapidly producing two nations—one a rural wasteland and the other an urban slum.

President Johnson, in a major policy address in Dallastown, Pa., on September 3 last, said:

The cities will never solve their problems unless we solve the problems of the towns and smaller areas.

And he concluded:

Modern industry and modern technology and modern transportation can bring jobs to the countryside rather than people to the cities.

That is the objective of this bill—that is what we hope to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the purpose of this bill is to bring the benefits of an expanding economy to rural and smalltown America—there is a specific clause which prohibits the pirating of industry from another section.

My bill simply provides an added tax incentive to industry that locates a new plant or branch plant in smalltown and rural America—and it deserves strong support.

JEWISH OPPRESSION

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today marks the commencement of the Passover season, sacred to Jews the world over, commemorating the flight of the Jews from their persecutors in Egypt.

It is a sad fact that in this day and age Jews are still suffering oppression in certain countries of this world.

One of the worst offenders is the Government of the Soviet Union. For many years now it has denied to Jews fundamental civil and religious rights accorded other groups. Alone among Soviet nationalities, Jews are denied schools and other institutions necessary for the perpetuation of their heritage. They are forbidden formal and official contacts with coreligionists in other countries. Jews are not even allowed any form of nationwide federation of congregations or clergy. And this is only a partial listing of the Soviet practices toward Jews which violate fundamental human rights.

For this first day of Passover, a joint statement has been released signed by 300 Members of the House of Representatives, condemning Soviet suppression of Jewish religious, cultural, and spiritual life. I am proud to be a signer of that statement and to have played a role in its preparation and in obtaining such widespread support for it. It is particularly significant that the signers—185 Democrats and 115 Republicans, from every State in the Union—represent all shades of opinon, and that the list includes our honored Speaker, Mr. MCCORMACK, the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, and the minority leader, Mr. FORD, as well as the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. MORGAN, and the ranking minority member of that distinguished committee, Mrs. BOLTON.

I have no doubt that such diversity reflects the widespread bipartisan American sentiment against the repressive Soviet policies. It is our devout hope that such an expression of strong disap-

proval of the Soviet Union's discrimination against the Jewish people will help to awaken the sensibilities of the Soviet Government to the worldwide condemnation of its policies in this respect and exert a positive influence for improvement.

The list is not closed, and those Members who have not yet indicated their support for the statement are cordially invited to do so.

The joint statement and list of signers, as of noon today, follow:

STATEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON SOVIET JEWRY

The undersigned Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States associate themselves with their fellow citizens and people of good will throughout the world in condemning the suppression of Jewish spiritual and cultural life in the U.S.S.R. The evidence presented by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry leaves no room for reasonable men to doubt that the government of the U.S.S.R. continues to pursue a program calculated to destroy the means of Jewish cultural and spiritual survival, and to break the will of Soviet Jewry to live as Jews. Such a practice not only violates fundamental human rights, it is contrary to the guarantees of Soviet law and asserted policy.

Alone among Soviet nationality groups, Jews are forbidden the schools and other institutions of Jewish learning, teaching and publishing, that are required if the heritage of Jews is to be perpetuated. Alone among major religious groups in the Soviet Union, Jews are forbidden the right to have any form of nationwide federation of congregations or of clergy. Alone among major religious groups in the Soviet Union, Jews have no formal and official contacts between Soviet Jews and their co-religionists abroad. A systematic campaign of initimidation inhibits them from openly protesting these inequities.

Premier Alexei Kosygin declared recently that all citizens, including Jews, are free to leave the Soviet Union to join their relatives abroad. We await translation of those words into deeds.

These inequities imposed on Soviet Jews must be protested by everyone who values human rights of all individuals and all groups everywhere.

E. Ross Adair (Ind.)
Brock Adams (Wash.)
Joseph P. Addabbo (N.Y.)
John B. Anderson (Ill.)
William R. Anderson (Tenn.)
Mark Andrews (N. Dak.)
Frank Annuzio (Ill.)
Thomas L. Ashley (Ohio)
Wayne N. Aspinall (Colo.)
William H. Ayres (Ohio)
Walter S. Baring (Nev.)
William A. Barrett (Pa.)
William H. Bates (Mass.)
James F. Battin (Mont.)
Page Belcher (Okla.)
Alphonzo Bell (Calif.)
Charles E. Bennett (Fla.)
Tom Bevill (Ala.)
Edward G. Biester, Jr. (Pa)
Jonathan B. Bingham (N.Y.)
John A. Blatnik (Minn.)
Ray Blanton (Tenn.)
Hale Boggs (La.)
Edward P. Boland (Mass.)
Richard Bolling (Mo.)
Frances P. Boland (Mass.)
Francis P. Bolton (Ohio)
John Brademas (Ind.)
Frank J. Brasco (N.Y.)
Jack Brooks (Tex.)
Donald G. Brotzman (Colo.)
Clarence J. Brown, Jr. (Ohio)
Gary Brown (Mich.)
George E. Brown, Jr. (Calif.)
James T. Broyhill (N.C.)
Joel T. Broyhill (Va.)
John Buchanan (Ala.)
J. Herbert Burke (Fla.)
James A. Burke (Mass.)
Lawrence J. Burton (Utah)
Phillip Burton (Calif.)
George Bush (Tex.)
Daniel E. Button (N.Y.)
James A. Byrne (Pa.)
John W. Byrnes (Wis.)
Earle Cabell (Tex.)
William T. Cahill (N.J.)
Hugh L. Carey (N.Y.)
Bob Casey (Tex.)
Elford A. Cederberg (Mich.)
Emanuel Celler (N.Y.)
Frank M. Clark (Pa.)
Donald D. Clancy (Ohio)
Don H. Clausen (Calif.)
James C. Cleveland (N.H.)
Jeffery Cohelan (Calif.)
Harold R. Collier (Ill.)
Barber B. Conable, Jr. (N.Y.)
Silvio O. Conte (Mass.)
John Conyers, Jr. (Mich.)
Robert J. Corbett (Pa.)
James C. Corman (Calif.)
William C. Cramer (Fla.)
John C. Culver (Iowa)
Glenn Cunningham (Nebr.)
Emilio Q. Daddario (Conn.)
Dominick V. Daniels (N.J.)
John W. Davis (Ga.)
William L. Dawson (Ill.)
Eligio de la Garza (Tex.)
James J. Delaney (N.Y.)
John R. Dellenback (Oreg.)
John H. Dent (Pa.)
Edward J. Derwinski (Ill.)
Charles C. Diggs, Jr. (Mich.)
John D. Dingell (Mich.)
Harold D. Donohue (Mass.)
John G. Dow (N.Y.)
John Dowdy (Tex.)
Thaddeus J. Dulski (N.Y.)
Florence P. Dwyer (N.J.)
Bob Eckhardt (Tex.)
Ed Edmondson (Okla.)
Don Edwards (Calif.)
Jack Edwards (Ala.)
Joshua Eilberg (Pa.)
Marvin L. Esch (Mich.)
Edwin D. Eshleman (Pa.)
Frank E. Evans (Colo.)
George H. Fallon (Md.)
Leonard Farbstein (N.Y.)
Dante B. Fascell (Fla.)
Michael A. Feighan (Ohio)
Paul Findley (Ill.)
Paul A. Fino (N.Y.)
Daniel P. Flood (Pa.)
Thomas S. Foley (Wash.)
Gerald R. Ford (Mich.)
William D. Ford (Mich.)
L. H. Fountain (N.C.)
Donald M. Fraser (Minn.)
Samuel N. Friedel (Md.)
Richard Fulton (Tenn.)
Don Fuqua (Fla.)
Nick Galifianakis (N.C.)
Cornelius E. Gallagher (N.J.)
Edward A. Garmatz (Md.)
Tom S. Gettys (S.C.)
Robert N. Giaimo (Conn.)
Sam Gibbons (Fla.)
Jacob H. Gilbert (N.Y.)
Charles E. Goodell (N.Y.)
George A. Goodling (Pa.)
Henry B. Gonzalez (Tex.)
Kenneth J. Gray (Ill.)
Edith Green (Ore.)
William J. Green (Pa.)
Martha W. Griffiths (Mich.)
James R. Grover, Jr. (N.Y.)
Gilbert Gude (Md.)
G. Elliott Hagan (Ga.)
James A. Haley (Fla.)
Seymour Halpern (N.Y.)
Lee H. Hamilton (Ind.)
John Paul Hammerschmidt (Ark.)
James M. Hanley (N.Y.)
Richard T. Hanna (Calif.)
George V. Hansen (Idaho)
Julia Butler Hansen (Wash.)
William Henry Harrison (Wyo.)
James Harvey (Mich.)
William D. Hathaway (Maine)
Augustus F. Hawkins (Calif.)
Ken Hechler (W. Va.)
Margaret M. Heckler (Mass.)
Henry Helstoski (N.J.)
Floyd V. Hicks (Wash.)
Chet Holifield (Calif.)
Elmer J. Holland (Pa.)
Frank J. Horton (N.Y.)
Craig Hosmer (Calif.)
James J. Howard (N.J.)
William L. Hungate (Mo.)
John E. Hunt (N.J.)
Edward Hutchinson (Mich.)
Donald J. Irwin (Conn.)
Andrew Jacobs, Jr. (Ind.)
John Jarman (Okla.)
Charles S. Joelson (N.J.)
Harold T. Johnson (Calif.)
Robert E. Jones, Jr. (Ala.)
Joseph E. Karth (Minn.)
Abraham Kazen Jr. (Tex.)
James Kee (W. Va.)
Hastings Keith (Mass.)
Edna F. Kelly (N.Y.)
Carleton J. King (N.Y.)
Cecil R. King (Calif.)
Horace R. Kornegay (N.C.)
Theodore R. Kupferman (N.Y.)
Dan Kuykendall (Tenn.)
Peter N. Kyros (Maine)
Melvin R. Laird (Wis.)
Odin Langen (Minn.)
Sherman P. Lloyd (Utah)
Clarence D. Long (Md.)
Speedy O. Long (La.)
Donald E. Lukens (Ohio)
Richard D. McCarthy (N.Y.)
John W. McCormack (Mass.)
Joseph M. McDade (Pa.)
Jack H. McDonald (Mich.)
Robert C. McEwen (N.Y.)
John J. McFall (Calif.)
Torbert M. Macdonald (Mass.)
Clark MacGregor (Minn.)
Hervey G. Machen (Md.)
Ray J. Madden (Ind.)
Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (Md.)
Robert B. Mathias (Calif.)
Spark M. Matsunaga (Hawaii)
Lloyd Meeds (Wash.)
Thomas J. Meskill (Conn.)
George P. Miller (Calif.)
Wilbur D. Mills (Ark.)
Joseph G. Minish (N.J.)
Patsy T. Mink (Hawaii)
Chester L. Mize (Kans.)
G. V. Montgomery (Miss.)
William S. Moorhead (Pa.)
Thomas E. Morgan (Pa.)
Thomas G. Morris (N. Nex.)
F. Bradford Morse (Mass.)
Rogers C. B. Morton (Md.)
Charles A. Mosher (Ohio)
John E. Moss (Calif.)
Abraham J. Multer (N.Y.)
John M. Murphy (N.Y.)
William T. Murphy (Ill.)
Lucien H. Nedzi (Mich.)
Robert N. C. Nix (Pa.)
Barratt O'Hara (Ill.)
James G. O'Hara (Mich.)
Alvin E. O'Konski (Wis.)
Arnold Olsen (Mont.)
Thomas P. O'Neill (Mass.)
Richard L. Ottinger (N.Y.)
Edward J. Patten (N.J.)
Thomas M. Pelly (Wash.)
Claude Pepper (Fla.)
Carl D. Perkins (Ky.)
Jerry L. Pettis (Calif.)
Philip J. Philbin (Mass.)
J. J. Pickle (Tex.)
Otis G. Pike (N.Y.)
Richard H. Poff (Va.)
Howard W. Pollock (Alaska)
Joe R. Pool (Tex.)
Melvin Price (Ill.)

Robert Price (Tex.)
David Pryor (Ark.)
Roman C. Pucinski (Ill.)
Graham Purcell (Tex.)
Albert H. Quie (Minn.)
Tom Railsback (Ill.)
William J. Randall (Mo.)
Thomas M. Rees (Calif.)
Ogden R. Reid (N.Y.)
Ben Reifel (S. Dak.)
Ed Reinecke (Calif.)
Joseph Y. Resnick (N.Y.)
Henry S. Reuss (Wis.)
George M. Rhodes (Ariz.)
John J. Rhodes (Ariz.)
Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (Mich.)
Ray Roberts (Tex.)
Howard W. Robison (N.Y.)
Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (N.J.)
Byron G. Rogers (Colo.)
Paul G. Rogers (Fla.)
Fred B. Rooney (Pa.)
Benjamin S. Rosenthal (N.Y.)
William V. Roth (Del.)
Richard L. Roudebush (Ind.)
J. Edward Roush (Ind.)
Edward R. Roybal (Calif.)
Philip Ruppe (Mich.)
William F. Ryan (N.Y.)
Fernand J. St Germain (R.I.)
William L. St. Onge (Conn.)
John P. Saylor (Pa.)
Henry C. Schadeberg (Wis.)
James H. Scheuer (N.Y.)
Richard S. Schweiker (Pa.)
Fred Schwengel (Iowa)
George E. Shipley (Ill.)
Garner E. Shriver (Kans.)
B. F. Sisk (Calif.)
Henry Smith III (N.Y.)
James V. Smith (Okla.)
William Springer (Ill.)
Robert T. Stafford (Vt.)
Harley O. Staggers (W. Va.)
J. William Stanton (Ohio)
Tom Steed (Okla.)
Sam Steiger (Ariz.)
Robert G. Stephens, Jr. (Ga.)
Samuel S. Stratton (N.Y.)
W. S. Stuckey (Ga.)
Leonor K. Sullivan (Mo.)
Robert Taft, Jr. (Ohio)
Roy A. Taylor (N.C.)
Charles M. Teague (Calif.)
Herbert Tenzer (N.Y.)
Fletcher Thompson (Ga.)
Frank Thompson, Jr. (N.J.)
Robert O. Tiernan (R.I.)
John V. Tunney (Calif.)
Morris K. Udall (Ariz.)
Lionel Van Deerlin (Calif.)
Guy Vander Jagt (Mich.)
Joseph P. Vigorito (Pa.)
Joe D. Waggonner, Jr. (La.)
Jerome R. Waldie (Calif.)
E. S. Johnny Walker (N. Mex.)
G. Robert Watkins (Pa.)
Charles W. Whalen, Jr. (Ohio)
J. Irving Whalley (Pa.)
Richard White (Tex.)
William B. Widnall (N.J.)
Lawrence G. Williams (Pa.)
Larry Winn, Jr. (Kans.)
Lester L. Wolff (N.Y.)
Jim Wright (Tex.)
Wendell Wyatt (Oreg.)
John W. Wydler (N.Y.)
Sidney R. Yates (Ill.)
John Young (Tex.)
Clement J. Zablocki (Wis.)
Roger H. Zion (Ind.)

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE ACTION TO AVERT PARALYZING TRANSPORTATION STRIKES

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the discussion that has ensued today about the dangers of paralyzing transportation strikes. It is very true, as the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, that more than a year ago our President took note of this problem and said he was going to send down proposals. What strikes me as very curious is that this Congress has not taken any initiative in this period of more than a year to study the problem and come forth with recommendations on its own.

Insofar as I know the only hearing held on the problem of strikes consisted of about 5 minutes of discussion by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recently at the time of the impending railway strike.

I will be glad to yield to any Member of this body who can point to any discussions, any hearings, or any consideration that the Congress has given in the last year to this problem of strikes.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. Is the gentleman familiar with the bill that I have introduced, H.R. 5638?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am not. But I will ask my friend if he has had any hearings on it?

Mr. PICKLE. I have sent copies to your office and all Members' offices in the last 60 days trying to engender some support and discussion on this. But I do not believe I have heard from the gentleman as to his support or opposition to it.

Mr. FINDLEY. I will say to the gentleman, I do not happen to be on his committee and if I was, I certainly would support him. I just wonder if he has some channel through which he can get the leadership to give consideration to his bill.

Mr. PICKLE. In my opinion, hearings should be held on this subject and they should have been held.

Mr. FINDLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. I have called on the chairman of the committee today to call for hearings on this. I said in my remarks which I have extended, that the chairman said if this strike is not settled now, he would immediately start hearings. My point is that regardless of whether the strike is settled, and it would have to be on an ad hoc basis, we ought to hold hearings on this general subject now.

Mr. FINDLEY. I certainly agree with the gentleman, and I hope he succeeds.

Mr. PICKLE. To that extent I will say the gentleman is correct.

Mr. FINDLEY. I compliment the gentleman and I hope he will secure enough support from both sides of the aisle and get action on this.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

NATIONAL RAISIN WEEK SPEECH

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to invite the attention of the Members to an observance with which I have long been familiar as a resident of the San Joaquin Valley of California.

I refer to National Raisin Week. April 23 to 29 marks not only the 58th anniversary of National Raisin Week, but the continuance of the oldest—and perhaps most famous—national food week in the country.

Through the years, the distinguished Congressman from Fresno, Calif., Representative BERNIE SISK, has told the Members during National Raisin Week of the history and growth and importance of America's raisin industry. He has documented the contribution of the raisin industry to the economy of California and the Nation. And he has suggested that raisins have also contributed to the ever improving standard of health of our fellow Americans and of people in other lands.

On Wednesday, April 26, through the courtesy of the California Raisin Advisory Board, Congressman SISK and I will be privileged to offer the Members raisin pie dessert at lunch in the House dining room. We do so not only to remind you that this is National Raisin Week but to give you a chance to learn firsthand that raisins are a taste surprising treat.

We are confident that the hard working members of your staffs will enjoy the raisins in the sample packs distributed today to each Representative's office. Raisins, of course, are famed as an energy producing food, but I will leave it to you to judge whether they have noticeably increased the output of work in your offices.

Despite the promise implicit in the title of a smash stage and film musical comedy, the Nation's raisin industry has not succeeded since its birth 94 years ago without really trying.

On the contrary, long before the advent of cars and Avis, it tried harder. It is still doing so. Because it must.

For the raisin industry, success is a matter of holding even on per capita consumption—something a great many farm products have not been able to do. Holding a constant per capita rate of use means, of course, that sales grow as fast as the population does.

How have raisins managed to hold their own in the per capita consumption race? With the boom in convenience foods, the accompanying decline in home baking, and the mushrooming number of food products on the supermarket shelves, many once-popular food items have fallen by the wayside. Others have held their markets only by drastic price cuts.

Not so raisins. Why?

Many food industry leaders are con-

vinced the broad marketing advances set by raisins can be attributed almost entirely to the aggressive, industrywide promotional program of the California Raisin Advisory Board.

In recent years the board has conceived and promoted a highly effective marketing concept; namely, that raisins should join forces with as many related foods as possible, including the new processed and baked convenience items. This approach has paid handsome dividends for raisins.

In the late 1950's, for example, per capita consumption of raisins dropped to 1.4 pounds, partly as a result of several short-crop years. However, recent figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicate that raisins are now being consumed at the rate of 1.6 pounds per person per year. This has been accomplished without any reduction in the price received by the raisin industry. Just the opposite. Price records of the Raisin Administrative Committee show bulk raisins brought 11 to 11½ cents a pound 10 years ago, compared to 16½ to 18 cents in the past two seasons.

Essentially, the California Raisin Advisory Board's program is one of constant research and development, supported by merchandizing assistance to bakeries, supermarkets, and manufacturers of raisin products to make it convenient and more profitable for them to use more raisins.

Happily for the raisin industry, raisins themselves are well suited for use in a great many food items. One survey conducted by the Advisory Board noted at least 190 items in a grocery store that had raisins in them.

Another plus factor enjoyed by the raisin industry is profitability of the product. A grocery trade organization conducted an independent survey which indicated that raisins return $15.50 per annual dollar invested, compared to the average of $4.84 for dry groceries.

Dollar sales per shelf foot are critically important to any grocer, independent, or chain.

A recent study made in six representative stores, covering 8 weeks of sales, sharply confirmed the sales potential of what the industry calls the "amazin' raisin."

In dollar sales per shelf foot, dried fruit ranked sixth; ninth in unit sales per foot. Raisins rated first among dried fruit for dollar margin per foot and accounted for 40 percent of dried fruit sales. Moreover, in this study, raisins again proved that instead of hurting other sales, they suggest other foods and promote the sale of additional items.

Conceding these most helpful factors, however, I think that the raisin industry of California's San Joaquin Valley and the California Raisin Advisory Board can take major credit for the industry's growth and success.

It is an industry that thinks imaginatively, acts boldly, and plans for tomorrow.

Recognizing that today's busy homemaker likes her convenience foods and has become accustomed to less time at a hot stove, the California Raisin Advisory Board has created literally hundreds of ways for her to add the taste surprising treat of raisins to simple but exciting dishes.

A good deal of that effort is directed to teenagers and the young married, to assure that tomorrow's mothers know how to use raisins—lots of raisins—for their family's enjoyment—and good health.

Maybe the next 94 years will prove that California's raisin industry is going after the wrong market. But I would not bet on it. Any industry that can suggest 25 ways to eat a raisin has got to continue growing and prospering.

I am proud to salute the 100,000 raisin growers, packers, and employees—who are California's and America's raisin industry—during this 58th annual National Raisin Week.

GRANTS FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include pertinent extraneous material and tabular matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the consideration by my colleagues when the appropriation bill for the National Foundation for Arts and Humanities is taken up.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week the House of Representatives will consider the appropriations bill for the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities. A great hue and cry has been raised by some people to the effect that the Appropriations Committee's action in recommending $3.5 million instead of the $6 million budget requested will somehow cause us to lose ground in the cultural struggle to win the hearts and minds of men. I fail to see how grants to study the history of the comic strips plays any part in this struggle, but I do know that there are substantial sources or non-Government funds available to the academic communities. It seems somewhat ludicrous for liberals to criticize the reduction in the Government's own program when so many private foundations are continually contributing to the arts and humanities.

This week end every Member of Congress received a copy of the Ford Foundation Annual Report of 1966. This is only one of numerous foundations that make grants to benefit the arts and humanities. The Ford Foundation report shows that the Ford Foundation approved grants totaling $87,901,937 in 1966 for the arts and humanities. I include these grants at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Ford Foundation Annual Report of 1966

Humanities and the arts	Changes during the fiscal year	
	Grants (reductions)	Payments (refunds)
Symphony orchestras:		
Bank of New York, as trustee for the following [1]	$58,750,000	$58,750,000
American Symphony, New York City ($1,000,000)	500,000	50,000
Atlanta Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Baltimore Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Birmingham Symphony ($600,000)	200,000	30,000
Boston Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	
Brooklyn Philharmonia ($250,000)	75,000	15,000
Buffalo Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Chicago Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	
Cincinnati Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Cleveland Orchestra ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Columbus Symphony ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
Dallas Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Denver Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Detroit Symphony ($1,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Festival Orchestra, New York City ($350,000)	75,000	15,000
Florida Symphony, Orlando ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
Fort Wayne Philharmonic ($250,000)	75,000	15,000
Hartford Symphony ($1,000,000)	350,000	50,000
Honolulu Symphony ($750,000)	350,000	50,000
Houston Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Hudson Valley Philharmonic, Poughkeepsie ($250,000)	75,000	15,000
Indianapolis Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Jacksonville Symphony ($250,000)	75,000	15,000
Kalamazoo Symphony ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
Kansas City (Mo.) Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	750,000	150,000
Little Orchestra, New York City ($350,000)	75,000	15,000
Symphony orchestras—Continued		
Bank of New York, etc.—Continued		
Los Angeles Philharmonic ($2,000,000)	$500,000	$100,000
Louisville Orchestra ($500,000)	200,000	20,000
Memphis Symphony ($400,000)	100,000	20,000
Milwaukee Symphony ($1,000,000)	250,000	50,000
Minneapolis Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Nashville Symphony ($500,000)	200,000	20,000
National (Washington, D.C.) Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
New Haven Symphony ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
New Jersey Symphony, Newark ($500,000)	150,000	20,000
New Orleans Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	750,000	134,400
New York Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	500,000	100,000
North Carolina Symphony, Chapel Hill ($750,000)	250,000	50,000
Oakland Symphony ($1,000,000)	350,000	50,000
Oklahoma City Symphony ($600,000)	150,000	30,000
Omaha Symphony ($400,000)	100,000	20,000
Philadelphia Orchestra ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Phoenix Symphony ($600,000)	250,000	44,480
Pittsburgh Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Portland (Ore.) Symphony ($1,000,000)	250,000	50,000
Puerto Rico Symphony, San Juan (no trust participation)	375,000	
Rhode Island Philharmonic, Providence ($350,000)	150,000	15,000
Richmond Symphony ($500,000)	150,000	20,000
Rochester Philharmonic ($1,000,000)	750,000	150,000
Sacramento Symphony ($500,000)	200,000	20,000

See footnotes at end of table.

The Ford Foundation Annual Report of 1966—Continued

Humanities and the arts	Changes during the fiscal year	
	Grants (reductions)	Payments (refunds)
Symphony orchestras—Continued		
Bank of New York, etc.—Continued		
St. Louis Symphony ($2,000,000)	$500,000	$100,000
San Antonio Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	150,000
San Diego Symphony ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
San Francisco Symphony ($2,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Seattle Symphony ($1,000,000)	750,000	100,000
Shreveport Symphony ($350,000)	75,000	15,000
Syracuse Symphony ($750,000)	250,000	50,000
Toledo Orchestra ($500,000)	150,000	20,000
Tulsa Philharmonic ($500,000)	100,000	20,000
Utah Symphony, Salt Lake City ($1,000,000)	500,000	100,000
Wichita Symphony ($500,000)	150,000	20,000
Other artistic resources:		
Ballet training and resources:		
Boston Ballet, Inc	300,000	148,000
City Center of Music and Drama (New York)		200,000
City Center Joffrey Ballet	500,000	330,000
Houston Foundation for Ballet		
San Francisco Ballet Company		64,400
School of American Ballet		400,000
School of the Pennsylvania Ballet Company	450,000	325,000
Utah Ballet Society		35,000
Civic opera development:		
Baltimore Civic Opera Company		
Central City Opera House Association (Colorado)		35,000
Chautauqua Opera Association (New York)		20,000
Cincinnati Summer Opera Association		20,000
Connecticut Opera Association		20,600
Fort Worth Civic Opera Association		20,000
Houston Grand Opera Association		30,000
Kansas City Lyric Theatre (Missouri)		15,000
New Orleans Opera House Association		30,000
Opera Association of New Mexico		34,000
Opera Company of Boston	195,000	
Opera Guild of Miami		20,000
Opera Society of Washington (District of Columbia)		71,300
Seattle Opera Association	100,000	
Spring Opera of San Francisco		
Symphony Society of San Antonio		30,000
New York Pro Musica Antiqua: Production of early music and musical dramas		11,000
Professional training in music:		
Manhattan School of Music		
Peabody Institute of Baltimore		156,000
Resident theater program:		
Alley Theatre, Houston	1,400,000	137,500
American Shakespeare Festival Theatre and Academy, Stratford (Conn.)		98,400
California, University of (theatre group)		
Minnesota Theatre Company Foundation, Minneapolis (Tyrone Guthrie Theatre)		
Mummers Theatre, Oklahoma City	535,000	
Washington Drama Society (Arena Stage, Washington, D.C.)	896,450	
Tamarind Lithography Workshop: Development of lithographic art		
Theatre Communications Group: Cooperative program among nonprofit theaters		147,000
Development of individual talent:		
Advancement of creative aspects of music in the public schools:		
Music Educators National Conference	250,000	475,000
Virginia State College	85,000	21,250
Young Audiences, Inc		144,000
Grants-in-aid and fellowships:		
Administrative interns	(1,071)	63,716
Arts reporters, editors, and critics	(4,660)	25,730
Concert soloists		3,500
Marlboro School of Music		35,000
Poets and writers associated with theaters and opera companies	(18,750)	8,300
Programs for other talented individuals		16,338
North Carolina School of the Arts Foundation: Professional and academic training	1,500,000	250,000
Performances of works commissioned for concert artists receiving grants-in-aid:		
Denver Symphony Society		
Indiana State Symphony Society		
Pittsburgh Symphony Society		
Scholarships in independent art and music schools:		
Art Academy of Cincinnati		5,000
Art Association of Indianapolis		4,000
Development of individual talent—Continued		
Scholarships in independent art, etc.—Continued		
Art Institute of Chicago		$32,000
Art Students' League of New York		28,000
Atlanta Art Association		
California College of Arts and Craft		9,000
California Institute of the Arts:		
Chouinard Art School		4,000
School of Music		4,000
Cleveland Institute of Art		1,000
Cleveland Institute of Music		8,000
Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts		4,000
Cooper Union		7,000
Corcoran Gallery of Art		5,000
Cranbrook Gallery of Art		6,000
Dayton Art Institute		4,000
Juilliard School of Music		34,000
Kansas City Art Institute		
Layton School of Art		4,000
Manhattan School of Music		30,000
Mannes College of Music		8,000
Maryland Institute		
Memphis Academy of Arts		4,000
Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts		
Museum of Fine Arts (Boston)		19,000
New England Conservatory of Music		
Otis Art Institute		4,000
Peabody Institute of Baltimore		13,000
Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts		11,000
Philadelphia College of Art		15,000
Portland Art Association		
Pratt Institute		19,000
Rhode Island School of Design		30,000
San Francisco Art Institute		15,000
San Francisco Conservatory of Music		4,000
Society of Arts and Crafts (Detroit)		4,000
Worcester Art Museum		4,000
Whitney Museum of American Art: Staff travel to select works by contemporary American artists for exhibition in New York	$155,000	
Experiments, demonstrations, and studies:		
American Federation of Arts: Films for school art curriculum	511,500	
American Place Theatre: Readings and productions of new plays		80,000
City Center of Music and Drama (New York): Production of contemporary operas	100,000	125,000
International Council of Museums: Study of European artists and institutions		18,000
Juilliard School of Music: Book by Micheal St. Denis on theatrical training	22,500	22,500
Nelson Gallery Foundation (Kansas City, Mo.): Catalog of Chinese paintings	13,237	12,237
Yale University: Research in acoustical design	80,000	
The humanities:		
American Council of Learned Societies: Programs to advance scholarship in the humanities		567,000
American Historical Association: Bibliographies of British civilization		6,000
Conferences on humanistic study groups:		
Bowdoin College	36,500	36,500
Fordham University	(9,719)	(9,719)
Johns Hopkins University	36,000	36,000
Cooperative program with regional liberal-arts colleges to strengthen the humanities:		
Duke University	200,000	170,000
North Carolina, University of	200,000	170,000
Council on Library Resources: Research on library problems		1,000,000
Folger Shakespeare Memorial Library: National Shakespeare Anniversary Committee	(29,050)	
Rutgers University: Scholarly publication by the university press		13,000
Texas, University of: National literary translation center		
Special institutional grants:		
Carnegie Hall Corporation (New York): Stage renovation and improvement	200,000	200,000
Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts:		
City Center of Music and Drama		243,782
Juilliard School of Music		197,069
Metropolitan Opera Association		
Philharmonic Symphony Society of New York		316,052
Total, humanities and the arts	87,901,937	69,252,335

[1] Figures in parentheses in this column represent endowment funds held in trust by the Bank of New York, to be matched by the orchestras; principal of the endowments will be distributed in 1976. Figures in the other columns are direct grants, made in addition to the endowments, and are payable over a 5-year period on a nonmatching basis.

RUSSIAN SPACE DISASTER

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my sympathy and the sympathy of our Committee on Science and Aeronautics to the widow and orphaned children of the Russian astronaut, Col. Vladimir Komarov, who just suffered a disaster comparable to our own tragic one.

Space is still a hostile environment in which to operate. But when men give their lives to those things they believe are right and in the interest of their country, whether they are friends or foe,

I think it fitting that we recognize it. So I do want the RECORD to show our sympathy for the widow and her children.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that while we had a disaster, our present Surveyor, operating on the moon, is an outstanding success in the space program.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, ANNUAL REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 110)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the First Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.

As this report points out, extension and continuing education—once the neglected stepchild in the American educational system—has now become a vital part of that system. Benefiting 25 million citizens each year, continuing education is helping to meet the needs of America's adult population. It recognizes that education is a continuing process that does not end when the student leaves the classroom.

The Federal role in supporting continuing education began more than a century ago. As our society evolved and became more complex, the Federal effort intensified. Today, through Federally supported programs, we can cite these examples of progress:

American adults, denied the opportunity to learn when they were young, are being taught to read and write.

The poor and the unemployed, through special education and training, are being given a chance to stand on their own two feet.

Scientists, engineers, doctors, dentists and teachers are improving their skills and keeping up with the latest technological advances.

Employees at all levels of government are being trained to serve the public better.

These extensive efforts are complimented by our recent efforts under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to bring colleges and universities into local communities to conduct seminars and other programs on issues of great concern. Under this program we are focusing the intellectual resources and research facilities of higher education on problems affecting the daily lives of every citizen—from health and housing to transportation and recreation.

In its first year alone, the program reached every State in the Nation, with 300 colleges and universities participating. In fiscal 1968, this number will almost double.

The attached report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education details much of this progress and recommends a number of steps to strengthen continuing education in America.

After consultation with the Council, the administration developed and submitted to the Congress legislation to improve our continuing education programs under title I by—

Extending the program for another 5 years.

Enabling smaller colleges and universities to continue to participate.

Providing additional funds for experimental projects.

I commend this report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 21, 1967.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

EXPANSION OF CANINE CORPS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 824) to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting through the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, are authorized to acquire, train, and maintain as many dogs as may be necessary to be used in connection with law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise only to ask the gentleman, in support of this bill, which is a necessary bill, whether or not it is open-ended or there is any restriction on either the numbers or the amount of expense that could be used in this man-dog team, which is presently estimated at $2,390.

Mr. DOWDY. The Police Department estimates that no more than 25 new dogs will be acquired for training and added to the corps each year. The amount to be appropriated is left to the discretion of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's answer, which is quite satisfactory. As I understand it, this same legislation did pass in the 89th Congress.

Mr. DOWDY. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the expansion of the Canine Corps of the Metropolitan Police force as the need for such expansion may develop.

The use of dogs in urban police work originated in Belgium more than 50 years ago, and has since spread to many other countries. Today, more than 40 police departments in the United States are utilizing dogs in patrol work, and the number is increasing very rapidly.

The Canine Corps was first established in the District of Columbia in December 1959, and on April 19, 1960, six dogs went on the streets of the city with their handlers. By the end of that year, the number had increased to 20 such teams, and today the corps consists of some 80 teams on the streets and 11 more in training, for a total strength of 91.

PERFORMANCE OF THE CANINE CORPS

The types of work performed by these man-dog teams, and the effectiveness of the Canine Corps as an arm of the Metropolitan Police Department, are presented by the following statistics for the calendar year 1966. During this period, an average of 80 man-dog teams patrolled the streets of the Nation's Capital each month, and they responded on a total of 7,365 calls:

Type of work performed by dogs	Assignment	Resulted in arrest
Tracking	115	3
Open seeks	143	34
Building seeks	801	84
Chasing	19	16
Deterrent	87	52
Articles searched for and found	80	----------
Stolen cars recovered	110	----------

During the year 1966, a total of 944 felony cases and 2,395 misdemeanor cases were cleared by the use of the Canine Corps. A breakdown of actual arrests made in six major categories of crime, with dogs and without the use of dogs, is the following.

Offense	Arrests		
	Dogs used	Dogs not used	Total
Housebreaking	153	127	280
Robbery	43	141	184
Assault	37	98	135
Larceny	15	95	110
Carrying deadly weapon	26	88	114
Rape	3	2	5

From these figures it is seen that more than one-third of the arrests made in connection with these crimes were accomplished with the aid of dogs during that year.

In addition to their actual participation in these arrests, the dogs of the Canine Corps have proved invaluable on many other occasions by the deterrent effect of their mere presence at the scene of actual or potential trouble. The dogs' keen sense of smell enables them to locate fugitives hiding in buildings, junkyards, and other places where the policemen would otherwise have a most difficult and dangerous task in apprehending them.

Your committee is informed that for

several reasons any program of expansion of the corps cannot be made to proceed too rapidly. First, the recruitment and selection of the dogs must be accomplished carefully and deliberately. Then the training itself takes 14 weeks, and the nature of the training work forbids too large groups. In this connection also, each dog is assigned to one particular man, and this patrolman and his dog must be trained together. Thus, any rapid acceleration in the training program would take too many patrolmen off their regular beats at one time, to the detriment of law enforcement in the city. In addition, each man-dog team in service must be brought back for 1 day of refresher training every 2 weeks. For these reasons, the Police Department estimates that no more than 25 new dogs can be acquired, trained, and added to the corps each year.

Thus far, all the dogs in the Canine Corps have been donated, and thus have cost the Police Department nothing. However, if the contemplated program of expansion necessitates the purchase of any of the new dogs, it is estimated that they may cost as much as $250 each. An item of expense is involved in the fact that the policemen who handle these dogs must transport them daily in their own cars, and also must keep the dogs at their homes. This calls for fenced yards and extra cleaning. Also, most of the work of these policemen must be performed at night. For these reasons, these men are paid additional compensation in the amount of $580 per year. With the exception of a few sergeants who perform this duty, all the officers who serve as dog handlers are grade 2 technicians.

The cost of training and adding a man-dog team to the Canine Corps is presently estimated at $2,390. This includes the handler's extra compensation, and the food and veterinary care for the dogs, but not any cost of purchase.

Enactment of this proposed legislation would provide legislative authorization for such expansion of this corps, which has proved such an invaluable asset to law enforcement in the District of Columbia, as future needs may dictate.

This bill is identical to H.R. 1935 of the 88th Congress—House Report No. 76—and to H.R. 1064 of the 89th Congress—House Report No. 19—both of which passed the House.

The following letter, written by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia during the 88th Congress, expresses their endorsement of this proposed legislation.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, February 25, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 1935, 88th Congress, a bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia. The bill authorizes the acquisition of as many dogs as may be necessary for police use. The police force now has approximately 70 dogs, most of which are on active duty. Some are still in training.

The Commissioners recognize that the man-dog teams of the Canine Corps of the Police Department have compiled an excellent record of crime detection and prevention since they first appeared on the streets of the District of Columbia in 1960. The corps was originally established on an experimental basis with five man-dog teams. With the concurrence of the congressional appropriation subcommittees the corps was continued on this basis through the fiscal year 1961. Fifty man-dog teams were authorized for fiscal year 1962 and 75 for fiscal year 1963.

The Commissioners have recommended an increase of 25 dogs in the budget for fiscal year 1964.

Therefore, the Commissioners recommend the enactment of this legislation.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Yours very sincerely,

F. J. CLARKE,
Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the bill just passed and any other District of Columbia bills which are considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

OBSCENE TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill—H.R. 828—to provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 828

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it shall be unlawful for any person to make use of telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia (1) for an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; (2) for repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or (3) for any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

(b) A violation of this section shall be deemed to have occurred at either the place at which the telephone call was made or the place at which the telephone call was received.

(c) Whoever violates this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

(d) Any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating this section shall be requested by the court to take a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the courts, and all costs of such examination shall be paid by the Government.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to affect the application of section 927 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 24–301), to any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with the violation of this section.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, strike out lines 7 through 11, and substitute thereof the following:

"(d) The court may in its discretion order any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating this section to undergo a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the court. All costs of such examination shall be paid by the Government."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 18, strike the period and add the following after the word "Government": "of the District of Columbia."

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would have no objection to that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman to say he would have no objection to the amendment?

Mr. DOWDY. No objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 17, after the word "court." insert "The court will order such an examination on demand of the person arrested, his attorney, or responsible next of kin."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment. It simply makes pre-judicial determination of unsoundness of mind, a two-way street. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it simply allows the same thing for the accused and the apprehended that the court may determine. This is in line, Mr. Speaker, with an overall bill for consideration of those of unsound mind and for admission to Federal hospitals which I have had in the last two Congresses and resubmitted in the well of the House recently. It simply gives the accused and the apprehended, or his attorney under the due process of law guaranteed by the Constitution, or his next of kin, the right to request that the courts have an examination by those qualified in mental examination, submit the evidence, and determine before the fact that he is of sound or unsound mind.

This is a two-way street, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that the gentleman will accept this additional sentence in this particular paragraph.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. I will say that I really doubt that this language is required for the purpose, but I would have no objection to it being written into the bill.

Mr. HALL. I certainly appreciate this, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the gentleman has accepted the intent of the amendment, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield for about 30 seconds?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last words and yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this legislation, but I think there is one minor thing we have overlooked. We mention it in the report, but make no mention of it in the bill, and that is decoy telephone laws. Would the gentleman think that that was covered as well as obscene calls and harassment calls?

Mr. DOWDY. I did not understand the gentleman on the kind of calls.

Mr. GROSS. Decoy calls, that is a burglar calling as a matter of decoying.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how we would reach that, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. We would provide punishment for the call for the obvious purpose of burglary, a person obviously calling to decoy the police or to decoy an individual.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman think this would be covered under these words: "For repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any of those provisions, in answer to my friend from Texas, goes precisely to the question of decoy calls.

I will not belabor this, but I will hope the gentleman will give it further consideration and perhaps do something in conference, if it is meritorious.

Mr. DOWDY. If it is necessary, I will be happy to do it. I would think the kind of calls the gentleman is talking about would rather go into the scheme of actually being part of the burglary itself, and the person who was taking part in that would be an accomplice at least in the commission of the burglary. We will check on that, however.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 828 is to provide criminal penalties to persons found guilty of making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia.

The bill makes it unlawful for any person to make use of telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia for the following purposes:

First. For an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably to be expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons;

Second. For repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or

Third. For any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

The bill further provides that a violation shall be deemed to have occurred either at the place where the telephone call was made, or at the place where the call was received.

The bill subjects violators to a fine of not more than $500 or to imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both. The laws of Maryland and Virginia impose similar penalties.

Present District of Columbia law—District of Columbia Code, section 22–1121—a disorderly conduct statute, provides a maximum penalty of $250 fine, or 90 days' imprisonment, or both, but it is not specifically directed to the offenses referred to in the bill. It does not furnish a good base for prosecutions of offenders contemplated in the reported bill, as it has proven difficult for the prosecution to prove that telephone calls of the kind referred to herein are a violation of that law.

The bill as introduced further provides that a pretrial mental examination shall be requested by the court of any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating the above provisions, such examination to be at a mental hospital designated by the court, and the cost thereof to be paid by the Government. This has been amended as hereinafter stated.

Finally, provision is included in the bill to assure that nothing in the enforcement of the bill will affect the application of the provisions of the District of Columbia Code with respect to insane criminals and to the commitments thereof.

BACKGROUND

There is hardly a Member of Congress who has not heard complaints from his secretary or staff members who have been the victims of obscene, annoying, or harassing telephone calls at some time or other.

According to information filed with your committee, an increasing number of perverts, burglars, and just plain cranks are using the telephone to plague Washington area residents—particularly women.

Police and prosecutors throughout the area report hardly a day goes by without at least one complaint of an obscene call, some of them involving obscene messages to women, others decoy calls by burglars.

Between 34 and 40 cases a month are under active investigation by the telephone company's security force. Counted as one case is the caller who has given the same shockingly indecent spiel to a hundred or more women.

Washington residents, unprotected by any kind of law against telephone harassment, face this pattern of cases:

A pervert posing as a doctor was believed to have made more than 50,000 calls throughout the area over a period of several years before his recent capture, in nearby Maryland. His spiel: Telling women that their husbands had visited him for delicate medical help and asking them numerous intimate questions.

A university's telephone switchboard was tied up so completely that all school business came to a halt because of one family's domestic crisis. The man got 20 of his friends to keep calling the university where his wife worked. They said nothing, simply breathed into the telephone, but no other calls could come through.

Two District firms—a moving company and a barbershop—nearly went out of business through telephone harassment directed not at the firms but at some employee. In both cases, calls swamped telephone facilities.

A current trap for the unwary is the telephone survey. It is used by both burglars and perverts in the District.

The perverts use the survey to entice the housewife into carrying on an innocent conversation before the caller moves into obscenity.

Police believe burglars are employing the survey technique to "case" a house without running any risk of being spotted. Cited as a typical example is the housewife's response to the seemingly innocuous questions of a caller posing as a TV market analyst.

The bill has the support of the U.S. Department of Justice, the Metropolitan Police Department, the local telephone company, and other groups.

PRECEDENT

This bill is identical to H.R. 10497 of the 89th Congress—House Report No. 1132—which passed the House on October 11, 1965, except for the amendment as reported above.

AMENDMENT

The committee's amendment to this bill was requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and provides that the court may order a person arrested for violation of this act to undergo a pretrial mental examination, rather than merely requesting that he do so as provided in the bill as introduced.

Following is the letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia under date of March 20, 1967, expressing their approval of this proposed legislation, as amended:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, March 20, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia desire to report on H.R. 828, 90th Congress, a bill "To provide criminal penalties for making certain telephone calls in the District of Columbia."

Subsection (a) of the bill makes it unlawful for any person to use telephone facilities or equipment in the District of Columbia (1) for an anonymous call or calls if in a manner reasonably expected to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; (2) for repeated calls, if with intent to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass one or more persons; or (3) for any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

Subsection (b) provides that a violation of the bill shall be deemed to have occurred at either the place where the telephone call was made or at the place where the telephone call was received.

Subsection (c) makes a violator subject to a fine of not more than $500, or to imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both.

Subsection (d) provides that any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating the bill "shall be *requested* by the court to take a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the court, and all costs of such examination shall be paid by the Government." (Emphasis supplied.)

Subsection (e) provides that nothing in the bill shall be deemed to affect the application to any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating the bill, of section 927 of the Act approved March 3, 1901 (D.C. Code, sec. 24–301), providing for commitment to D.C. General Hospital of persons charged with offenses and suspected of being of unsound mind.

The existing District of Columbia disorderly conduct statue (D.C. Code, sec. 22–1121) provides in part that whoever, with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, or under circumstances such that a breach of the peace may be occasioned thereby, acts in such a manner as to annoy, disturb, interfere with, obstruct, or be offensive to others, shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both. This provision of the disorderly conduct statute on occasion has been used to prosecute persons who by using a telephone annoy or harass other persons with anonymous, repeated, or obscene and lewd calls. The Commissioners are informed, however, that as a practical matter it has been very difficult for the prosecution to prove that such calls, by such means, constitute a violation of the disorderly conduct statute.

Maryland and Virginia have statutes which prohibit the type of conduct made unlawful by the bill. Both statutes provide for a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment up to twelve months, or both. See Article 27, § 555A, Annotated Code of Maryland (1964); § 18.1–9 and 238 Code of Virginia (1950); and § 18.1–238.2, Code of Virginia (1964 Supp.).

Accordingly, the Commissioners believe the bill is needed for the purpose of providing an effective means of dealing with the kind of activity prohibited by it. However, they suggest that subsection (d) of the bill might be made more effective were it amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Court may in its discretion order any person arrested, indicted, or otherwise charged with violating this section to undergo a pretrial mental examination, at a mental hospital designated by the court. All costs of such examination shall be paid by the Government."

The Commissioners urge enactment of the bill.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, D.C.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, for almost 2 years now I have been trying to get some effective legislation on the law books to protect the citizens of the District of Columbia from obscene and harassing telephone calls. During the 89th Congress, the District of Columbia Committee, behind the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, favorably reported, and the House later unanimously passed, my bill to raise the penalties for obscene phone calls made within the District. The bill is before us again today.

Last year, when my bill reached the Senate, the District Committee began hearings, but for some reason suspended the inquiry after only 1 day of testimony. Subsequently there was introduced a Senate bill to place Federal penalties on obscene telephone calls made in interstate commerce. The bill, however, neglected the District of Columbia, the main area of my original concern.

Since it appeared that the Senate District Committee had deferred to the Senate Commerce Committee on this legislation, I introduced an amended version of the Senate bill which included the District under its provisions. In the end, the Senate passed a bill similar to my second bill making it a Federal crime to make an obscene phone call in interstate commerce or within the District of Columbia.

At the end of the 89th Congress, the House had passed my bill to raise penalties on calls made within Washington, and the Senate had passed a bill including interstate calls as well as District of Columbia calls. In effect, therefore, no law resulted.

Mr. Speaker, this exact same situation is going to result this year unless the Congress can reach an understanding. The Senate Commerce Committee has reported out a bill similar to the one it passed last year. Today, we in the House are considering legislation affecting the District alone.

My sincere concern is for the residents of the District of Columbia who have been denied adequate protection from the pranksters and perverts who continuously abuse the telephone lines. Although it appears that protection is also needed in regards interstate telephone calls, the real problem, and the problem which seems to me most pressing today, is the calls made in the District.

Mr. Speaker, the communications industry has made commendable and effective efforts during the past 2 years to develop methods of apprehending obscene phone callers. But without effective penalties, the deterrent effect of such methods shrinks proportionately. Today, the usual penalty in the District is a $10 disorderly conduct fine. The bill before us today raises that penalty to a $500 fine and/or 12 months in jail. This punishment is more in line with the penalties exacted by our neighboring States of Virginia and Maryland.

In addition, the apprehended obscene phone caller will be offered psychiatric help, which in many cases is desperately needed and desired. This bill is a strict, yet enlightened, approach to combat the growing menace.

I am sincerely hopeful that the Senate will act on this legislation before us today. We need protection in the District now. The question of interstate calls is a separate question and can be dealt with apart from this bill. It would be most unfortunate for some imagined rivalry to prevent the Senate from acting to help protect the citizens of our Nation's Capital. I have no doubt that with speedy action by the Senate we can have this law enacted before the summer. In any event, I remain hopeful, and the menacing calls continue.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS FOR WIDOWS OF RETIRED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill—H.R. 2824—to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, who married such officer or member after his retirement, may qualify for survivor benefits, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a)(3) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–521(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'widow' means the surviving wife of a member or former member if—

"(A) she was married to such member or former member (i) while he was a member, or (ii) for at least two years immediately preceding his death, or

"(B) she is the mother of issue by such marriage."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall apply with respect to any surviving wife of a "member" (as that term is defined in subsection (a)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act) or former member irrespective of whether such wife became a "widow" (as that term is defined in such amendment) prior to, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that no annuity shall be paid by reason of the amendment made by this Act for any period prior to the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1967.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

I should like to ask the gentleman who supports the bill a question. I must say that I am in support of it also, provided we can find out how many widows are estimated to be affected.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say there is no way to estimate that.

Mr. HALL. Is part of the problem because the widow could have become a spouse after the fireman or policeman had retired?

Mr. DOWDY. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Second, I ask the gentleman, what is the estimate of cost?

Mr. DOWDY. There has been no estimate of cost.

Mr. HALL. Is that for the same reason, that it would be impractical to figure? Will there be a diminishing cost per year?

Mr. DOWDY. I do not know that that would be true. Under the present law a surviving widow cannot draw benefits unless she were married to the policeman or fireman at the time of his retirement. This will provide that if she were married to him for at least 2 years immediately preceding his death, or if she is the mother of issue of such marriage, she could draw benefits.

This would continue into the future. It would not apply just to those presently retired, but would apply to future retirees.

This is the same as was passed by the House last year. We passed this as a part of another bill.

Mr. HALL. I will say to the gentleman that I certainly am in favor of the bill being applicable if the widow is indeed the mother of issue of the retiree. I believe there can be no question about that.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. This measure passed the House of Representatives last year and was deleted in conference due to the fact that widows of veterans who were married after their retirement were not entitled to survivors benefits unless they had been married 5 years prior to the death of the veteran.

The measure should no longer be objectionable because, as I understand it, the same provision is pending right now in the Congress, as a result of action of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a veteran who has been married for 1 year after retirement, so that the widow would be entitled to benefits.

Mr. HALL. I believe that is the provision which passed the House under the veterans legislation the other day, now pending in the other body.

In the opinions both of the gentleman from Texas and of the gentleman from Virginia, I discern that this is entirely in the interest of equity and justice, compared to other benefits we give to our veterans' widows. I strongly support it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to a situation of which he is undoubtedly aware.

In the general area of benefits for police and firemen, the area of salaries, I believe the gentleman is fully aware of the fact that the morale of the police force of the District of Columbia is at a very low ebb, for reasons we need not enumerate at this time.

In the general pay legislation which is pending, it seems to me there is a possible source of further discontent, because under that proposal we would increase rather dramatically the wage of the starting policemen and of the ones who are at the top of the heap in the Police Department, and leave out to a large extent those officers who have been members of the force for a number of years—those who are between those two levels.

Mr. DOWDY. That is the pending legislation, and there was such legislation in the last Congress.

Mr. KYL. Has there not been a proposal by the administration for further adjustments in the salary?

Mr. DOWDY. I say, I think there is such a bill pending in the present Congress, though it is not before my subcommittee. I do not know whether hearings have been held on it up to the present date.

Mr. KYL. There is another matter concerned in that proposal which has come to the Hill, which I hope that the committee may take cognizance of, and that is this: Under that proposal there would be a large number of detectives who have achieved that rank through seniority and by passing examinations for qualification who would be faced with probably going back to the rank of uniformed policemen even though they had achieved their present rank through their own diligent efforts and service. I would hope that the committee may take a look at that legislation so that we do not destroy this standard.

Mr. DOWDY. I am sure it will be looked at. I believe that this bill is before the subcommittee of which the chairman is the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]. He is here and might have some comments to make on it.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I will say to the gentleman that we have been making a very thorough study of morale, retention, and recruitment, and also of proposed crime legislation. I can assure the gentleman that based upon past experience in our subcommittee and in the full committee, whatever pay legislation may be brought out will be equitable to all ranks. We are concerned about recruitment and morale and all of the other problems which have been so dramatically unfolded in hearings before the subcommittee. It would be rather improvident to undertake at this time to state to the gentleman what will be forthcoming because our studies have not been completed.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read in the paper this morning a statement attributed to Commissioner Tobriner, who is credited with having issued an order to the Chief of Police, Mr. Layton, that he, the Chief of Police, cannot recruit policemen from two or three States, one of them being North Carolina and another, I believe, Tennessee. At least, one of the States was North Carolina. I think this is a slander on the people of the States which he mentioned. I hope that the Committee on the District of Columbia in their legislation dealing with the recruitment of police—and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] just mentioned the consideration of recruitment legislation—will call Mr. Tobriner before the Committee on the District of Columbia and find out why the citizens of any State of the United States are unqualified out of hand to serve in the Police Department of the District of Columbia.

I wonder if this rule will apply to the recruitment of police dogs for the District of Columbia; whether Mr. Tobriner would say that dogs cannot be recruited from certain States in the South for service in the Washington Police Department.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I have not read the story to which the gentleman refers, but I would not be surprised at such statements being made, because it seems a great deal of what goes on in public around here is for the benefit of those who professionally seem to hate the South. I can only say as a North Carolinian that perhaps one of the reasons North Carolina was included would be that it would be very difficult, I think, to talk any intelligent North Carolinian into leaving North Carolina to come here where the head of the government makes such statements about our State.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that the gentleman to whom this statement is attributed does not want great policemen and so, probably, for that reason, he has excluded those who might be recruited from the great State of North Carolina.

The statement attributed to Commissioner Tobriner is unjustifiable. I cannot imagine why one in high position would express such prejudice against the citizens of the great State of North Carolina. Perhaps he will realize the error of his position without delay. If not, there will be a change in policy by the Congress, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised a question a moment ago regarding a statement made by the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia with reference to recruitment, and the exclusion of residents of certain States from the recruitment practices by the Metropolitan Police Department. I believe something further should be said about this problem.

One of the difficulties that we have faced as we have conducted hearings and had investigations made on the morale, recruitment, and law enforcement problems was the attitude of those in leadership in the District government. A great deal of the morale problem, according to our expert who looked into the matter, as well as from comments that we had in testimony from the Police Association of the District of Columbia, resulted from the attitude of the President of the Board of Commissioners toward the entire police organization.

I am not one to engage in attacks upon anyone. I am sure the gentleman to whom I refer is sincere in his attitude. But, I must say that I believe he was sincerely wrong in most of his expressed attitudes toward the police in the District of Columbia. We will not have in my judgment a high morale situation in the District of Columbia in the law enforcement field until there is a changed attitude at the top in the District of Columbia government.

When a kind word is said by the President of the Board of Commissioners about the police he always seems to accompany it with a threat that if they make one misstep the full weight of the District government is to fall upon that individual policeman's head.

This has been a very disturbing thing to members of the Police Department. It has been a disturbing thing to those of us who have tried so diligently to improve law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

The statement to which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] referred, in my judgment, would constitute another hammering of a nail into the head of those who are trying to do something about the morale problem and building up of the Police Department.

I was delighted that here today we have passed legislation again expressing the attitude of the Congress on the canine corps. We have had testimony before our subcommittee which indicates that the President of the Board of Commissioners or someone in authority has set upon a pattern of destroying the effective operation of the canine corps. Passage of the legislation relating to the canine corps clearly expresses the will of Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know just who is applying the pressure which brings about these unfortunate statements from the District building. I do know that such statements are doing so much to destroy the existing police department and its morale, and are preventing effective recruitment.

This is a very serious matter. Crime in the District of Columbia is all out of proportion and it is continuing to grow. The situation will not be helped in any way by unwise and foolish statements either by Members of Congress or by appointed officials in the District of Columbia government.

I would hope that the zeal for publicity would subside down at the District building and that dislike for certain regions of the country on the part of some misguided individuals will not further affect in a harmful and deleterious manner the performance of their very important duties in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina and would just say I do not think that Mr. Tobriner has enough practical sense to come in out of the rain.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, sir, I do not know about that, but he is president of the District Commission and his statements do seem to attract headlines. I would hope he would think them through in the future before he makes them. Otherwise, we may have a continuing shower of crime in the District of Columbia that will envelop all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2824 is to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who married such an officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivor benefits under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act.

REASONS FOR LEGISLATION

Under existing law, if a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia marries subsequent to his retirement, upon his death his widow is not entitled to any pension whatever. Your committee is of the opinion that this is an injustice and should be corrected.

Accordingly, H.R. 2824 provides that in the event that a retired such officer or member marries after his reitrement, his widow will be entitled to the same full benefits as provided in subsection (a) (3) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act to which she would be entitled had she married the officer or member during his active service. It is specified, however, that in order to qualify for such pension the widow must have been married to such officer or member for at least 2 years prior to his death, or that she be the mother of issue by the marriage. This bill is patterned in general after similar provisions of civil service law as applied to classified Government workers.

This bill is identical to a provision in title II of H.R. 15897 of the 89th Congress, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Policemen and Firemen's Salary Act. This bill passed the House on June 27, 1966, but that provision was subsequently deleted by House and Senate conferees.

The reason for this action was that it came to the attention of the conferees that a similar provision in present law pertaining to widows of retired veterans contains a 5-year minimum for the length of such marriage before the widow can qualify for a pension. This created some doubt as to the propriety of the 2-year minimum which this provision in H.R. 15897 would have imposed in the case of widows of retired District of Columbia policemen and firemen. However, your committee is informed that on March 20, 1967, the House of Representatives amended S. 16 so as to decrease the minimum period of marriage for widows of retired veterans from 5 years to 1 year, and that Senate action on this amendment is now pending. Hence, it would appear that the 2-year minimum period for widows of deceased District of Columbia policemen and firemen, as proposed in H.R. 2824, is well within comparable limits of similar legislation.

Your committee feels that this proposed legislation will correct an inequity of long standing, and commends it to this body for favorable action.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to urge the support of my colleagues in the House for the bill H.R. 2834, which is identical to H.R. 7356 which I introduced last March 16.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide that the widow of a retired member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, who married the member after his retirement, be entitled to an annuity if she had been married to the retiree for at least 2 years prior to his death or is the mother of issue by the marriage.

Under present District of Columbia law, such a widow is entitled to no benefits whatever. I regard this restriction as archaic and fundamentally unfair, and submit that it should be corrected within the limitations imposed by this bill, at once.

In veterans' retirement and survivor benefits legislation, there is presently a 5-year minimum period for the marriage, when contracted subsequent to the veteran's retirement, and this fact persuaded House and Senate conferees to drop this provision last year from H.R. 15897, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Policemen and Firemen's Salary Act. However, this impediment now appears to have been removed, since the House has recently approved a bill which will decrease this minimum period to 1 year for veteran retirees' marriages.

For these reasons, it is my opinion that this legislation is in the public interest and should be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EQUALIZED BENEFITS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 2897) to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2897

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) each officer or member of the Metropolitan

Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the United States Secret Service who has been retired under the provisions of the fourth paragraph of section 12 of the Act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as in effect prior to October 1, 1956, during the period beginning before October 1, 1956, and continuing through July 1, 1967, and who is receiving maximum disability benefits under such paragraph for injury received or disease contracted in the line of duty, shall, on and after the first pay period which begins July 1, 1967, have his retirement benefits computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–527(1).

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to reduce the relief or retirement compensation any person receives, or is entitled to receive, from the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out lines 3 through 9, and on page 2 strike out lines 1 through 9, and insert the following:

"That (a) each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the U.S. Secret Service who has been retired during the period beginning before October 1, 1956, and continuing through July 1, 1967—

"(1) under the provisions of the fourth paragraph of section 12 of the act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as in effect prior to October 1, 1956, and

"(2) on the basis of a disability which was rated at 100 per centum at the time of his retirement,

shall, on and after the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1967, have his retirement benefits computed and paid in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g)(1) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, sec. 4–527(1)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2897, as amended and reported, is to provide that former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, the U.S. Secret Service, and the District of Columbia Fire Department who were retired prior to October 1, 1956, for disability which was rated at 100 percent at the time of their retirement, shall have their annuities computed on the same basis as are those for members who retired for disability subsequent to that date.

BACKGROUND

From 1916, when the Policemen and Firemen's Relief Fund was first established by act of Congress, until 1957, there was never any disparity in the pensions paid to retired members of the Fire Department and the several police forces in the District of Columbia, or to their widows and dependent orphaned children. All who retired at the same rank and with the same length of service received equal amounts, regardless of changes in contribution rates.

In 1957, however, this long-established policy was abandoned by the enactment of Public Law 85–157, which amended the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act to provide substantial increases in the annuities for those members retiring after October 1, 1956, and for their widows and orphaned children, but provided no increases whatever for annuitants who had retired prior to that date, nor for their surviving dependents.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

Because of the hazards and vicissitudes incident to service in their police and fire forces, members of this committee and many of their colleagues in the House have long felt that this discrimination in the annuities for retirees from these services, and for their surviving dependents, is unfair and should be eliminated. In fact, at the time of the enactment of the amendments to the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act in 1957, it was recognized by some Members of Congress that some adjustment to the pensions of older retirees should be the subject of future legislation.

Accordingly, in the 86th Congress a bill, H.R. 3735, to restore the traditional uniformity to all such annuities, regardless of the date of retirement, was passed by the House. The Senate passed this bill with an amendment providing that the annuities of the former members who retired prior to October 1, 1956, would be increased by 10 percent, rather than being made equal to those of the later retirees. The House agreed to this amendment, but despite this modification the bill was vetoed on September 24, 1959.

This effort was resumed in the 87th Congress. S. 1528, identical to the bill as vetoed in the previous Congress except for the deletion of a provision for retroactivity of increases in pensions for surviving dependents of deceased former members, was approved by the Congress but also was vetoed, on September 22, 1961.

By that time, the plight of many of the widows and dependent children of deceased members who had retired or died prior to October 1, 1956, had grown particularly difficult by reason of the very meager annuities to which they were then entitled, and which were inadequate to cope with the steadily rising cost of living. In recognition of this problem, this committee reported S. 1918 on August 8, 1962, extending the benefits of the 1957 amendments to the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act to all widows and orphaned dependent children of deceased members on a nonretroactive basis. The bill was approved on August 24, 1962, and became Public Law 87–601.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Prior to October 1, 1956, a member of the Police or Fire Departments who retired by reason of disability incurred in line of duty was entitled to an annuity not to exceed 50 percent of his last annual salary. Such a member retiring after that date for disability incurred in line of duty, however, receives an annual pension computed at 2 percent of his last annual salary per year of service, with a minimum of 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent.

Your committee feels strongly that this situation is a gross injustice, and that at least those older retirees who were rated at 100 percent disability by the Retirement Board, and who thus sacrificed their health and their earning ability in the performance of their hazardous service, are richly entitled to the same annuity benefits as all other retirees in similar circumstances, regardless of their date of retirement. Furthermore, your committee is convinced that the Equalization Act of 1923, which bases all District of Columbia Police and Fire Departments retirees' pensions upon increased salaries whenever there is a salary increase for these forces, does not provide truly equitable treatment by any means for these older totally disabled members, as long as there remains a disparity of from 16⅔ percent to 20 percent in their annuity rates as compared with those of their brothers in service who retired after October 1956. These men faced the same hazards of service, suffered the same loss of physical ability to earn their living as did those who retired under the same circumstances at a later date, and are now facing the same high costs of living. Under these circumstances, it is the view of your committee that the existing difference in the amounts of their annuities should be eliminated, as a matter of simple justice.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

For these reasons, your committee urges favorable action on H.R. 2897, which provides simply that members of the various Police forces and the District of Columbia Fire Department who retired prior to October 1, 1956, for disability incurred in line of duty and which was rated at 100 percent under the Veterans Manual at the time or their retirement, shall have their annuities computed on the basis of the formula provided by the 1957 amendments to the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act which have been in effect since October 1, 1956. This provision is to be effective on and after the first pay period, which begins after July 1, 1967.

This would increase the pension of such a retiree from the present figure of 50 percent of his last annual salary, as adjusted under the Equalization Act of 1923, to a minimum of 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent of such salary, depending upon his length of service.

As introduced, H.R. 2897 was identical to a provision in title II of the bill H.R. 15857 of the 89th Congress, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act, which passed the House on June 27, 1966. That provision, however, was subsequently deleted from the bill by House and Senate conferees.

This action by the conferees resulted from a misunderstanding that existed when the language of the provision was drafted. At that time, it was the impression of your committee that a policeman or fireman who was retired for disability prior to October 1, 1956, and who was receiving the maximum allowable annuity of 50 percent of his last annual salary, had been granted this maximum annuity by reason of having been rated by the Retirement Board as 100 percent disabled under the standards of the Veterans Manual. For this reason, the provision in question was so worded as to grant the more liberal benefits to all

members of these forces retired for disability prior to October 1, 1956, and receiving the maximum annuity—50 percent—for such disability. This language would have affected the annuities of some 748 older retired members, which some of the conferees felt would pose a problem.

Recently, however, your committee has learned that members of the Police and Fire Departments who retired for service-incurred disability before October 1, 1956, were awarded the maximum annuity rate of 50 percent if they were rated under the Veterans Manual to be at least 50 percent disabled. Thus, the same rate of pension was granted for disability rated anywhere from 50 percent to 100 percent. In view of this information, your committee amended H.R. 2897 to specify that the more liberal retirement benefits will be authorized only for those older retirees whose disability at the time of retirement was rated at 100 percent, which had been their original intent.

An examination of the personnel files of the members of these police forces and the District of Columbia Fire Department who are presently receiving annuities by reason of retirement for disability of various degrees incurred in line of duty prior to October 1, 1956, reveals that there are some 726 annuitants today, but that only 192 of these were rated under the Veterans Manual at 100 percent disability at the time of their retirement. Thus, not more than 192 retirees will be affected by this proposed legislation, and it is estimated that the cost involved for the first full fiscal year will be approximately $280,000. This cost will of course diminish in the years thereafter.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my wholehearted support of the bill H.R. 2897, the purpose of which is to correct in part an injustice of long standing with respect to former members of the Metropolitan Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who retired prior to October 1, 1956. This proposed legislation provides for such members who retired for service-incurred disability rated at 100 percent the same rates of annuity as are provided for those who retired for disability after the date of October 1, 1956.

Until 1957, when the Congress enacted major amendments to the Policemen and Firemen's Disability Act, effective as of October 1, 1956, there had never been any disparity in the annuities paid to retired members of these forces or to their surviving dependents. These amendments, however, established for the first time a very considerable difference between the amounts granted to those who retired prior to October 1, 1956, as compared to the annuities of those who retired thereafter.

I and some of my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee have felt strongly that this action was basically unfair, and we have made persistent efforts to remove this differential and to restore the traditional equality of treatment to all such retirees and their dependents. Bills were passed by the Congress in the 86th and 87th Congresses, which sought to restore this equality to some degree, but both were vetoed. In the late stages of the 87th Congress, however, we did succeed in enacting Public Law 87–601, which equalized the pensions of widows and dependent children of the earlier retirees who had died. To this day, however, nothing has been accomplished to equalize the annuities of the retired members themselves.

The bill H.R. 2897, which is identical to H.R. 7355 which I introduced on March 16 of this year, seeks to provide what I consider a very meager minimum of justice, by equalizing the pensions of only those members of the Police and Fire Departments who retired prior to October 1, 1956, for disability incurred in line of duty and which was rated by the Retirement Board under the provisions of the Veterans Manual at 100 percent.

At present, these older disabled retirees are entitled to an annuity of 50 percent of their last annual salary. However, the policeman or fireman who retired after October 1, 1956, for any degree of disability draws an annuity computed at 2 percent of his last annual salary per year of service, with a minimum of 66⅔ percent and a maximum of 70 percent. Considering that these men faced the same dangers and hazards in their daily work, and are now beset by the same rising costs of living, this situation in my opinion is totally inequitable. In this bill we are not asking the full equalization of pensions which we believe to be justified, nor even equal treatment of all who retired by reason of disability. We merely want to obtain for the earlier retirees who were totally disabled in service and thus have sacrificed at least to a large degree their ability to earn a living, the same financial reward as is presently granted to their brothers in service who retired after the magical date of October 1, 1956, for any degree of disability whatever. Obviously, many of these latter are capable of earning a living in some other line of work.

I am informed that at present, there are approximately 820 former members of the Police and Fire Departments who retired prior to October 1, 1956, living and drawing annuities. Of this number, some 726 were retired for disability of various degrees, which is eloquent testimony to the extreme physical dangers which these men faced in the performance of their daily duties. Further, 192 of these men were rated at the time of their retirement as being 100 percent disabled. These are the men whose annuities would be increased by this proposed legislation by from 16⅔ percent to 20 percent.

As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider this legislation to be adequate, by any means, to eliminate the injustice which I feel was done to these retired policemen and firemen in the amendments of 1957. From the standpoint of practicality, however, in the light of our experience in the 86th and 87th Congresses, I wholeheartedly commend this legislation for favorable consideration by my colleagues in the House as at least a minimum of just treatment for these gallant public servants who gave so much of their lives and their health for the benefit of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND CHARTER ACT OF CONFERENCE ON STATE SOCIETIES

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 3931) to amend the act of April 3, 1952, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3931

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia", approved April 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 37), is amended as follows:

(1) The first section of such Act is amended by striking out "by the name of 'Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia' " and inserting in lieu thereof "by the name of 'National Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia' ".

(2) Section 18 of such Act is amended by striking out " 'Conference of State Societies, Washington, D.C.,' " and inserting in lieu thereof " 'National Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia,' ".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out lines 7 through 11, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The first section of such Act is amended by striking out "by the name of the 'Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia' " and inserting in lieu thereof "by the name of the 'National Conference of State Societies, Washington, District of Columbia' "."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of H.R. 3931 is to amend the charter act of the Conference of State Societies, H.R. 4467, approved April 3, 1952, Public Law 82–293—66 Stat. 37—in order to change its name to "National Conference of State Societies."

The Conference of State Societies was incorporated by the 1952 act referred to, for the purposes of promoting friendly and cooperative relations between the various States and territorial societies in the District of Columbia, to foster, participate in and encourage educational, cultural, charitable, civic and patriotic programs and activities in the District of Columbia and surrounding communities, and to act as contact agent with the States for carrying out State and national programs.

Today its membership includes 52 active State societies, including Guam and Puerto Rico, with approximately 60,000 persons belonging.

Because or the broadening of the scope of the activities of the Conference of State societies, it has requested this legislation to change its name to National Conference of State Societies.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in a letter to the chairman dated March 23, 1967, stated that they

have no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

No opposition to it has been expressed to your committee.

Letter from the Conference of State Societies requesting this legislation, are made a part of this report, as follows:

CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1967.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following background material is offered for your information in respect to H.R. 3820 and H.R. 3931 amending P.L. 293, Eighty-Second Congress, Chapter 131, Second Session (H.R. 4467), April 3, 1952.

"Section Two, Purpose of Corporation, The purpose of this corporation shall be to promote friendly and cooperative relations between the various state and territorial societies in the District of Columbia and to foster, participate in and encourage educational, cultural, charitable, civic and patriotic programs and activities in the District of Columbia and surrounding communities, *to act as contact agent with states for carrying out state and national programs.*"

"Section Four, Headquarters and principal offices of the corporation shall be located in Washington, District of Columbia, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place *but may be conducted throughout the various states and territories of the United States.*"

Current membership consists of fifty-two active societies, including Guam and Puerto Rico, whose aggregate totals approximately sixty thousand persons. Direction is provided by a governing board comprised of one delegate from each society. Management is provided by an Executive Committee comprised of delegate officers who are elected annually for terms of one year. An annual audit of "nonprofit" funds is made by an independent Certified Public Accountant in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and a report is submitted to the House Judiciary Committee as required by the act.

In the past three years, the Conference has engaged in charitable, educational and cultural activities of international scope. Most recently, the Grand Ball of the National Cherry Blossom Festival, held at the Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., joined together all of the Americans in a program of considerable importance. It is the belief of the Executive Committee, therefore, that sufficient justification exists to warrant an official change in name which will truly reflect organizational status and activity.

Your kind consideration in this matter will be gratefully appreciated.

Sincerely,
ROBERT J. SCHISSELL, *President.*

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested—and have acceded to that request—not to call up today for consideration H.R. 3973, the next bill scheduled for consideration.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H.R. 7417) to prescribe administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7417

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act".

OTHER AUTHORITY

SEC. 2. This Act shall supplement all other provisions of law establishing procedures to be observed by the Commissioners and agencies of the District government in the application of laws administered by them, except that this Act shall supersede any such law and procedure to the extent of any conflict therewith.

DEFINITION

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Commissioners" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent;

(2) the term "District" means the District of Columbia;

(3) the term "agency" includes both subordinate agency and independent agency;

(4) the term "subordinate agency" means any officer, employee, office, department, division, board, commission, or other agency of the government of the District, other than an independent agency or the Commissioners, required by law or by the Commissioners to administer any law or any rule adopted under the authority of a law;

(5) the term "independent agency" means any agency of the government of the District with respect to which the Commissioners are not authorized by law, other than this Act, to establish administrative procedures, but does not include the several courts of the District and the District of Columbia Tax Court;

(6) the term "rule" means the whole or any part of any Commissioners or agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or to describe the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of the Commissioners or of any agency;

(7) the term "rulemaking" means Commissioners or agency process for the formulation, amendment, or repeal of a rule;

(8) the term "contested case" means a proceeding before the Commissioners or an agency in which the legal rights, duties, or privileges of specific parties are required by any law (other than this Act), or by constitutional right, to be determined after a hearing before the Commissioners or before an agency, but shall not include (A) any matter subject to a subsequent trial of the law and the facts de novo in any court; (B) the selection or tenure of an officer or employee of the District; (C) proceedings in which decisions rest solely on inspections, tests, or elections; and (D) cases in which the Commissioners or an agency act as an agent for a court of the District;

(9) the term "person" includes individuals, partnerships, corporations, associations, and public or private organizations of any character other than the Commissioners or any agency;

(10) the term "party" includes the Commissioners and any person or agency named or admitted as a party, or properly seeking and entitled as of right to be admitted as a party, in any proceeding before the Commissioners or an agency, but nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the Commissioners or an agency from admitting the Commissioners or any person or agency as a party for limited purposes;

(11) the term "order" means the whole or any part of the final disposition (whether affirmative, negative, injunctive, or declaratory in form) of the Commissioners or of any agency in any matter other than rulemaking, but including licensing;

(12) the term "license" includes the whole or part of any Commissioners or agency permit, certificate, approval, registration, charter, membership, statutory exemption, or other form of permission;

(13) the term "licensing" includes process respecting the grant, renewal, denial, revocation, suspension, annulment, withdrawal, limitation, amendment, modification, or conditioning of a license by the Commissioners or an agency;

(14) the term "relief" includes the whole or part of any Commissioners or agency (A) grant of money, assistance, license, authority, exemption, exception, privilege, or remedy; (B) recognition of any claim, right, immunity, privilege, exemption, or exception; and (C) taking of any other action upon the application or petition of, and beneficial to, any person;

(15) the term "proceeding" means any process of the Commissioners or an agency as defined in paragraphs (6), (11), and (12) of this section; and

(16) the term "sanction" includes the whole or part of any Commissioners or agency (A) prohibition, requirement, limitation, or other condition affecting the freedom of any person; (B) withholding of relief; (C) imposition of any form of penalty or fine; (D) destruction, taking, seizure, or withholding of property; (E) assessment of damages, reimbursement, restitution, compensation, costs, charges, or fees; (F) requirement, revocation, or suspension of a license; and (G) taking of other compulsory or restrictive action.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GENERAL PROCEDURES

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioners shall, for themselves and for each subordinate agency, establish or require each subordinate agency to establish procedures in accordance with this Act.

(b) Each independent agency shall establish procedures in accordance with this Act.

(c) The procedures required to be established by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall include requirements of practice before the Commissioners and each agency.

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner shall publish at regular intervals not less frequently than once every two weeks a bulletin to be known as the "District of Columbia Register," in which shall be set forth the full text of all rules filed in the office of the Commissioners during the period covered by each issue of such bulletin, except that the Commissioners may in their discretion omit from the District of Columbia Register rules the publication of which would be unduly cumbersome, expensive, or otherwise inexpedient, if, in lieu of such publication, there is included in the Register a notice stating the general subject matter of any rule so omitted and stating the manner in which a copy of such rule may be obtained.

(b) All courts within the District shall take judicial notice of rules published or of which notice is given in the District of Columbia Register pursuant to this section.

(c) Publication in the District of Columbia Register of rules adopted, amended, or repealed by the Commissioners or by any agency shall not be considered as a substitute for publication in one or more newspapers of general circulation when such publication is required by statute.

(d) The Commissioners are authorized to publish in the District of Columbia Register,

in addition to rules published under authority contained in subsection (a) of this section, (1) cumulative indexes to regulations which have been adopted, amended, or repealed; (2) information on changes in the organization of the District government; (3) notices of public hearings; (4) codifications of rules; and (5) such other matters as the Commissioners may from time to time determine to be of general public interest.

(e) This section shall become effective thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

PUBLIC NOTICE AND PARTICIPATION IN RULEMAKING

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioners and each independent agency shall, prior to the adoption of any rule or the amendment or repeal thereof, publish in the District of Columbia Register (unless all persons subject thereto are named and either personally served or otherwise have actual notice thereof in accordance with law) notice of the intended action so as to afford interested persons opportunity to submit data and views either orally or in writing, as may be specified in such notice. The publication or service required by this subsection of any notice shall be made not less than thirty days prior to the effective date of the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal, as the case may be, except as otherwise provided by the Commissioners or the agency upon good cause found and published with the notice.

(b) Any interested person may petition the Commissioners or an independent agency, requesting the promulgation, amendment, or repeal of any rule. The Commissioners and each independent agency shall prescribe by rule the form for such petitions, and the procedure for their submission, consideration, and disposition. Nothing in this Act shall make it mandatory that the Commissioners or any agency promulgate, amend, or repeal any rule pursuant to a petition therefor submitted in accordance with this section.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if, in an emergency, as determined by the Commissioners or an independent agency, the adoption of a rule is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, safety, welfare, or morals, the Commissioners or such independent agency may adopt such rules as may be necessary in the circumstances, and such rule may become effective immediately. Any such emergency rule shall forthwith be published and filed in the manner prescribed in section 7 of this Act. No such rule shall remain in effect longer than one hundred and twenty days after the date of its adoption.

FILING AND PUBLISHING OF RULES

SEC. 7. (a) Each agency, within thirty days after the effective date of this Act, shall file with the Commissioners a certified copy of all of its rules in force on such effective date.

COMPILATION OF LAW

(b) The Commissioners shall keep a permanent register open to public inspection of all rules.

(c) Except in the case of emergency rules, each rule adopted after the effective date of this Act by the Commissioners, or by any agency, shall be filed in the office of the Commissioners. No such rule shall become effective until after its publication in the District of Columbia Register, nor shall such rule become effective if it is required by law, other than this Act, to be otherwise published, until such rule is also published as required in such law.

COMPILATION OF RULES

SEC. 8. (a) As soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act, the Commissioners shall have compiled, indexed, and published in the District of Columbia Register all rules adopted by the Commissioners and each agency and in effect at the time of such compilation. Such compilations shall be promptly supplemented or revised as may be necessary to reflect new rules and changes in rules.

(b) Compilations shall be made available to the public at a price fixed by the Commissioners.

(c) The Commissioners must publish the first compilation required by subsection (a) of this section within one year after the effective date of this Act and no rule adopted by the Commissioners or by any agency before the date of such first publication which has not been filed and published in accordance with this Act and which is not set forth in such compilation shall be in effect after one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

DECLARATORY ORDERS

SEC. 9. On petition of any interested person, the Commissioners or an agency, within their discretion, may issue a declaratory order with respect to the applicability of any rule or statute enforceable by them or by it, to terminate a controversy (other than a contested case) or to remove uncertainty. A declaratory order, as provided in this section, shall be binding between the Commissioners and the agency, as the case may be, and the petitioner on the state of facts alleged and established, unless such order is altered or set aside by a court. A declaratory order is subject to review in the manner provided in this Act for the review of orders and decisions in contested cases, except that the refusal of the Commissioners or of an agency to issue a declaratory order shall not be subject to review. The Commissioners and each agency shall prescribe by rule the form for such petitions and the procedure for their submission, consideration, and disposition.

CONTESTED CASES

SEC. 10. (a) In any contested case, all parties thereto shall be given reasonable notice of the afforded hearing by the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be. The notice shall state the time, place, and issues involved, but if, by reason of the nature of the proceeding, the Commissioners or the agency determine that the issues cannot be fully stated in advance of the hearing, or if subsequent amendment of the issues is necessary, they shall be fully stated as soon as practicable, and opportunity shall be afforded all parties to present evidence and argument with respect thereto. Unless otherwise required by law, other than this Act, any contested case may be disposed of by stipulation, agreed settlement, consent order, or default.

(b) In contested cases, except as may otherwise be provided by law, other than this Act, the proponent of a rule or order shall have the burden of proof. Any oral and any documentary evidence may be received, but the Commissioners and every agency shall exclude irrelevant, immaterial, and unduly repetitious evidence. Every party shall have the right to present in person or by counsel his case or defense by oral and documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. Where any decision of the Commissioners or any agency in a contested case rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, any party to such case shall on timely request be afforded an opportunity to show the contrary.

(c) The Commissioners or the agency shall maintain an official record in each contested case, to include testimony and exhibits, but it shall not be necessary to make any transcription unless a copy of such record is timely requested by any party to such case, or transcription is required by law, other than this Act. The testimony and exhibits, together with all papers and requests filed in the proceeding, and all material facts not appearing in the evidence but with respect to which official notice is taken, shall constitute the exclusive record for order or decision. No sanction shall be imposed or rule or order or decision be issued except upon consideration of such exclusive record, or such lesser portions thereof as may be agreed upon by all the parties to such case. The cost incidental to the preparation of a copy or copies of a record or portion thereof shall be borne equally by all parties requesting the copy or copies.

(d) Whenever in a contested case a majority of those who are to render the final order or decision did not personally hear the evidence, no order or decision adverse to a party to the case (other than the Commissioners or an agency) shall be made until a proposed order or decision, including findings of fact and conclusions of law, has been served upon the parties and an opportunity has been afforded to each party adversely affected to file exceptions and present argument to a majority of those who are to render the order or decision, who, in such case, shall personally consider such portions of the exclusive record, as provided in subsection (c) of this section, as may be designated by any party.

(e) Every decision and order adverse to a party to the case, rendered by the Commissioners or an agency in a contested case, shall be in writing and shall be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. The findings of fact shall consist of a concise statement of the conclusions upon each contested issue of fact. Findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be supported by and in accordance with the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence. A copy of the decision and order and accompanying findings and conclusions shall be given by the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be, to each party or to his attorney of record.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 11. Any persons suffering a legal wrong, or adversely affected or aggrieved, by an order or decision of the Commissioners or an agency in a contested case, is entitled to a judicial review thereof in accordance with this Act upon filing in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals a written petition for review, except that orders and decisions of the Board of Zoning Adjustment, Commission of Mental Health, Public Service Commission, Redevelopment Land Agency, and the Zoning Commission shall be subject to judicial review in those courts which review the orders and decisions of those agencies on the day before the date of enactment of this Act but such judicial review shall be in accordance with this Act. If the jurisdiction of the Commissioners or an agency is challenged at any time in any proceeding and the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be, take jurisdiction, the person challenging jurisdiction shall be entitled to an immediate judicial review of that action, unless the court shall otherwise hold. The reviewing court may by rule prescribe the forms and contents of the petition and, subject to this Act, regulate generally all matters relating to proceedings on such appeals. A petition for review shall be filed in such court within such time as such court may by rule prescribe and a copy of such petition shall forthwith be served by mail by the clerk of the court upon the Commissioners or upon the agency, as the case may be. Within such time as may be fixed by rule of the court the Commissioners or such agency shall certify and file in the court the exclusive record for decision and any supplementary proceedings, and the clerk of the court shall immediately notify the petitioner of the filing thereof. Upon the filing of a petition for review, the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall have power to affirm, modify, or set aside the order or decision complained of, in whole or in part, and, if need by, to remand the case for further proceedings, as justice may require. Filing of a petition for review shall not in itself stay

enforcement of the order or decision of the Commissioners or the agency, as the case may be. The Commissioners or the agency may grant, or the reviewing court may order, a stay upon appropriate terms. The court shall hear and determine all appeals upon the exclusive record for decision before the Commissioners or the agency. The review of all administrative orders and decisions by the court shall be limited to such issues of law or fact as are subject to review on appeal under applicable statutory law, other than this Act. In all other cases the review by the court of administrative orders and decisions shall be in accordance with the rules of law which define the scope and limitations of review of administrative proceedings. Such rules shall include, but not be limited to, the power of the court—

(1) so far as necessary to decision and where presented, to decide all relevant questions of law, to interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and to determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of any action;

(2) to compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and

(3) to hold unlawful and set aside any action or findings and conclusions found to be (A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; (B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; (C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations or short of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations or short of statutory rights; (D) without observance of procedure required by law, including any applicable procedure provided by this Act; or (E) unsupported by substantial evidence in the record of the proceeding before the court.

In reviewing administrative orders and decisions, the court shall review such portions of the exclusive record as may be designated by any party. The court may invoke the rule of prejudicial error. Any party aggrieved by any judgment of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals under this Act may seek a review thereof by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in accordance with sections 11–321, 17–101, 17–102, 17–103, and 17–104 of the District of Columbia Code.

PURPOSE OF BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide an Administrative Procedure Act for the District of Columbia, covering the more than 93 administrative governmental agencies operating in the District, and the laws which those agencies administer.

The bill makes mandatory the establishment by the District of Columbia Commissioners for themselves and for all of their subordinate agencies, rules governing the formal and informal procedures prescribed or authorized by the bill, and likewise requires that each independent agency of the District establish such rules for itself.

It is designed to meet the long-admitted need in the District of Columbia for the reform of administrative process and the achieving of uniformity of administrative rules and rulemaking procedures—paralleling the adoption by the Congress of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act covering the Federal administrative agencies.

Nineteen States have enacted similar legislation.

This bill is identical to H.R. 7067 of the 89th Congress, as approved by the House on July 26, 1965—House Report 646.

This legislation is the result of many years of careful work by a number of lawyers in your committee and in the District of Columbia. It has the endorsement of the District of Columbia Bar Association, as well as of the State division of the Administrative Law Section of the American Bar Association.

Full hearing was accorded interested parties by Subcommittee No. 4 on July 6, 1965.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

In essence, the bill has three primary features:

I

First, it provides for the compilation and publication in the District of Columbia Register of all rules and regulations of the administrative agencies of the District of Columbia which are currently in effect. In addition, it would require that prior to the adoption of any rule, or the amendment or repeal of any rule, a notice of such intended action must be published in the District of Columbia Register. The bill thus would afford interested persons the opportunity to submit data or facts on proposed rules or changes in administrative rules before final action is taken by the agency.

Your committee was advised that 14 of the 22 boards and commissions under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Department of Occupations and Professions alone had no procedural rules at all. Among rules that are published, it is claimed that many contain "little or no exposition of one's rights, few procedural details, inadequate references to the availability and types of hearings, no hint as to appellate review, vague or incomplete statements as to applicable standards, and no references to statutory citations."

II

The second major purpose of the bill is to provide the opportunity of a hearing for all parties in "contested cases," as specifically defined in the proposed bill, and to require that a transcript of the record be kept in all such cases. In addition, the bill would minimize the possibilities of an agency relying on information dehors the record in reaching a decision in a contested case. While the bill is not as explicit as the Federal Administrative Procedure Act in curtailing opportunities of ex parte consultations, it should suffice until trial and error shows that it does not go far enough.

Under the present procedure within the Department of Inspections and Licenses, for example, when a hearing is requested by a licensee or an applicant for a license, the Department transmits the record to the Board of Appeals and Review, but does not forward to the Board, "confidential intradepartmental or interdepartmental correspondence or documents or information of a confidential nature." These it transmits, instead, separately to the Assistant Corporation Counsel who represents the Department of Inspections and Licenses in the particular case and on whose advice the Board most surely will heavily rely.

In recent years, the press has reported that there have been a number of complaints made by applicants who were denied, or had revoked, licenses as pawnbrokers, cabdrivers, automobile salesmen, and practical nurses, to mention just a few, on the grounds that the particular licensing board or commission concerned based their denial or revocation on evidence not found in the record before the agency. Under H.R. 7417, this could not be done.

Similarly, recent complaints have been voiced that the Board of Zoning Adjustment and the Zoning Commission have, on occasion, based their decisions on some hidden reservoirs of alleged facts or knowledge not set out or referred to in the record of the proceedings before the agency.

III

The third important general purpose of the bill is to provide for a uniform means, whereby the final determination of any agency, other than certain rules or decisions expressly excepted by other provisions of the act, may be reviewed in court in accordance with traditional standards, as enunciated in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the other Federal courts of appeal, controlling judicial review of administrative action.

Although the judicial review of the decisions of many agencies of the District of Columbia government now is provided for, or at least, permitted, it is not systematized, and in other instances no clearly defined avenue or channel of judicial review of administrative action is established. Certainly, the Congress will agree that unless parties and litigants have judicial recourse they are, in practical effect, at the mercy of the administrative agencies to whom they must come in seeking vindication or important personal and property rights.

For example, in a zoning decision of some interest, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ruled that the denial of a petition to rezone must be accompanied by findings of fact justifying the reversal, *Donovan* v. *Clark*—222 F. Supp. 634 (D.C., 1963). The Donovan decision thus reaffirmed and applied an elemental principle of fair administrative procedure so far as appeals from decisions of the Zoning Commission to the district court are concerned. However, because of the variety of review channels that exist for appeals from actions of the many various boards and agencies of the District of Columbia, there is no insurance, in the absence of an overall statutory requirement, that the principle that requires administrative findings to accompany administrative decisions will be protected in all future cases.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia concede the need for the reform of the administrative process in the District. However, they do not consider that the representations of the bar association and other groups, complaining existing administrative practices and procedures, establish a public demand or need for an Administrative Procedure Act for the District. Through the Corporation Counsel's Office, they urge that such reforms as are needed can be achieved by rules or orders of the Commissioners, or by the agencies themselves, thus obviating the need for legislation.

Admittedly, some of the conditions complained of have been remedied, in part of the issuance of rules of procedure in some instances where none existed before.

But while there has been improvement in rulemaking and the promulgation thereof, during the past 10 years of advocacy of reforms in District of Columbia administrative procedures, there has been no improvement in, and the Commissioners are powerless to provide, uniform judicial review, or judicial review of and appeals from quasi-judicial agencies. For example, decisions of the District of Columbia Board of Appeals and Review—to which administrative appeals lie from the various constituent agencies within the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections—must be brought to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. On the other hand, within the District Department of Occupations and Professions there are a significant number of constituent boards, commissions, and committees from whose rulings appeals lie to several different courts and, in at least one case, must be brought to the Board of Commissioners themselves, whose action purports to be final—2 District of Columbia Code, 1305 (1961). We have listed the specifics of this statutory maze in the footnote.[1]

Only Congress, through a bill such as H.R. 7417, can unravel such complexity and simplify the review procedures in question.

BACKGROUND

Since 1965 legislation similar to the reported bill has been introduced, considered, and modified in an effort to prescribe definite administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government.

The adoption by the Congress in 1946 of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act—60 Stat. 237—covering the Federal administrative agencies, set the pattern for many of the States to follow. Thus far, the following 19 States have adopted a State Administrative Procedure Act, or portions thereof; guaranteeing minimum standards of fair administrative procedure: Arkansas, California, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Virginia.

The reported bill is based upon the model act for administrative procedures in the States, approved by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. However, it has been modified and adjusted by the Administrative Law Committee of the District of Columbia Bar Association, and by subcommittees of your committee, to embrace the functions of the District, which operates sometimes as a State, sometimes as a city, sometimes as both. Obviously, all the provisions of the usual model State Administrative Procedure Act may not successfully be applied literally to the varied operations of the many different administrative agencies in the District of Columbia. Hence, the model act has been revised in many respects to meet local conditions, so the reported bill is well developed and provides a comprehensive District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act.

CONCLUSION

The need for an Administrative Procedure Act for the District of Columbia to reform administrative process has been established to the satisfaction of your committee.

The District must achieve uniformity of administrative rules and rulemaking procedures and insist on a common, published repository of such rules, so that the person affected by them, as well as his attorney, may learn at least of their existence.

The time for enactment of such a law as H.R. 7417 is now.

The arguments advanced in opposition to the bill are the same arguments which were advanced by the Federal administrative agencies in opposition to the enactment of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act.

Only the Congress can resolve the issue and by a bill such as H.R. 7417 guarantee in the day-to-day operations of an administrative agency those procedures due any litigant.

Your committee believes the reported bill will improve orderly communications between the public at large and the agencies of the District of Columbia government. It would formalize needed procedures and end the informal, across-the-counter type of actions which have characterized too many decisions of some agencies of the District and resulted in too many complaints to and hearings by your committee in years past.

The passage of this bill, your committee believes, should increase the confidence of the public in the operations of administrative agencies of the District of Columbia and thereby add to administrative efficiency, to the benefit of all concerned. The confidence of the public and the bar can only be captured and retained if there are provided definite, objective, statutory standards of fair administrative procedure to guide, and if necessary to control the administrative powers of rulemaking and adjudication, and to assure a full right to judicial review when such powers have been abused or exercised in an unlawful manner.

The approval by the Congress of H.R. 7417 is therefore urged.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider, was laid on the table.

REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF PODIATRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill—H.R. 3370—to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3370

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia", approved May 23, 1918 (40 Stat. 560), as amended (sec. 2–705, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by designating the first paragraph as subsection (a), by redesignating the second and third paragraphs as subsections (b) and (c), respectively, and by adding at the end of the second paragraph, redesignated herein as subsection (b), the following: "The Board of Podiatry Examiners may, in its discretion, waive both the written and oral tests or either such test and accept in lieu thereof the satisfactory completion by an applicant of an examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners: *Provided,* That such applicant shall pass a practical examination given by the Board of Podiatry Examiners: *Provided further,* That in exercising its discretion to waive the written and oral tests or either such test the Board of Podiatry Examiners shall satisfy itself that the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners was as comprehensive as that required in the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Board of Podiatry Examiners may, in its discretion, require an applicant to satisfactorily complete an examination which supplements the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners, or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners, may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to compliment the gentleman from Texas, and the committee as a whole, and the minority Members in bringing this legislation to the floor, and their patience in so doing, and their being so forebearing over the past several District days in not calling this until certain determinations could be made.

Mr. Speaker, I have here from the president of the District of Columbia Po-

---

[1] Review by Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, final review by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit: Board of Barber Examiners for the District of Columbia, sec. 2–1110: Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia, sec. 2–129; Physical Therapists' Examining Board, sec. 2–463; Practical Nurses' Examining Board, sec. 2–434.

Revocation by District Court for the District of Columbia upon motion of the Board: Board of Dental Examiners, secs. 2–311, 2–312; Board of Podiatry Examiners, secs. 2–701, 2–708; Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia, sec. 2–213; Nurses' Examining Board, sec. 2–407.

Review by Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit: Board of Examiners and Registrars of Architects, sec. 2–1028.

Appeal from revocation by Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia: Board of Examiners of Veterinary Medicine, sec. 2–810.

Review by Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia: Board of Pharmacy, sec. 2–606.

Appeal to the Board of Commissioners only and purporting to be final: District of Columbia, Board of Cosmetology, sec. 2–1305.

Review by District Court for the District of Columbia: District of Columbia Board of Registration of Professional Engineers, sec. 2–1809; Real Estate Commission, sec. 45–1409.

diatry Society, Dr. Edward Ganny, under date of April 21, 1967, a statement which I would ask unanimous consent to be inserted in the RECORD following the remarks that I will conclude at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become apparent with the cooperation of the committee that this National Board of Podiatry Examiners examines on a basis of discretionary reciprocity with the District of Columbia podiatrists. Second, that they are well organized and led in that this requires not only 4 years of education, but a basic science examination at the end of the second year, ordinarily in the podiatry school, and then a final or fourth-year examination involved in the clinical purposes.

This is indeed according to the Podiatry Society of the District of Columbia, recognized in many of our States, in fact, the majority of them, as being generally a more severe and a more self-controlling and proving examination than the various States or the District of Columbia has.

Therefore being interested only in the maintenance of quality care to individuals I have absolutely no further reservation about this bill, but commendation for the committee on the manner in which they have handled it.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I rise simply for the purpose of commending them.

Mr. Speaker, the statement to which I referred earlier is as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PODIATRY SOCIETY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
April 21, 1967.

HON. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: We earnestly request your support for House Resolution No. 3370, introduced by Mr. McMillan, which "amends the the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia" to recognize the National Board of Podiatry Examinations" in lieu of the "local board's own theoretical examinations for licensing of podiatrists in the District." The National Board examination consists of two parts—Part I:

Part I, which includes comprehensive examinations in the basic sciences, such as anatomy, histology, embryology, bacteriology, bio-chemistry, chemistry, pathology, pharmacology, materia medica, physiology, hygiene and public health, generally is taken near the end of the student's second year.

Part II, which covers the fields of dermatology, syphology, jurisprudence, ethics, economics, orthopedics, foot gear podistric medicine, physical medicine, therapeutics, podiatry-chiropody, hospital protocal, radiology, foot pathology, diagnosis, surgery and anesthesia, is usually taken near the end of the student's fourth year of study.

National Board Examinations in Podiatry are now recognized in 27 states and British Columbia.

The Podiatry Society of the District of Columbia, annually submits a list of five well qualified members who are considered by the D.C. Board of Commissioners for appointment to any existing vacancies on the D.C. Board of Podiatry Examiners.

Our sincere thanks.

Respectfully,
EDWARD GANNY, DSC,
President of D.C. Podiatry Society.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill (H.R. 3370) is to provide the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners with the discretionary authority to accept the written theoretical examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners to virtually all graduates of the recognized podiatry colleges, in lieu of the local Board's own theoretical examinations for licensing of podiatrists in the District. However, a satisfactory performance on a practical demonstration test administered by the District of Columbia Board will continue to be required of all applicants for such license.

The National Board of Podiatry Examiners consists of 12 members, representing such nationally recognized professional organizations as the Federation of Podiatry Boards, the American Podiatry Association, and the American Association of Colleges of Podiatry. In addition, 13 groups of prominent educational testing specialists assist the national board in the development of its testing program, which is presently recognized and accepted in 19 States and by the Army and the Navy.

Your committee is advised that the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners favors the adoption of the national board theoretical examinations as the standard for licensing of podiatrists in the District because this examination, by reason of its national scope and character, offers a uniform and consistent measure of academic professional qualification. Also, the resources available to the national board make possible a rapid processing of these tests, and the early reporting of the results to the applicants. Further, all expenses incident to the preparation and administration of these tests are sustained by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners.

We are advised that the examination given by the national board is at least as comprehensive and as difficult as that conducted by the District of Columbia Board. However, this bill charges the District of Columbia Board with the responsibility of satisfying itself that this continues to be the case; and the Board is empowered in its discretion, to require any applicant to supplement his national board examination with whatever further theoretical test or tests the Board may deem advisable.

PRECEDENT

H.R. 6350, which was passed by the House on July 23, 1963, and which was approved on August 19, 1964—Public Law 88–460—extended an identical discretionary authority to the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners, enabling them to accept a national board examination in connection with the licensing of dental hygienists in the District of Columbia.

Your committee is of the opinion that this same authority should be granted with regard to the licensing of podiatrists in the District of Columbia, for the same reasons; namely, the elimination of a needless duplication of theoretical testing with a consequent saving of time and expense on the part of the District of Columbia Board, and also the alleviation of needless hardship on the part of applicants who may have been out of school for some years and yet can demonstrate professional competence by satisfactory performance on the practical demonstration test, which would still be required of all applicants.

HEARING

At a public hearing conducted on February 28, 1964, no opposition was expressed to the enactment of this legislation. This bill is identical to H.R. 9962 of the 88th Congress, which was passed by the House on March 9, 1964—House Report No. 1223—and also to H.R. 1699 of the 89th Congress, approved by the House on February 8, 1965—House Report No. 22.

The following letter, written on January 10, 1967, expresses the D.C. Commissioners' renewed endorsement of this proposed legislation.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1964.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended.

Existing law requires that the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners give an applicant for license as a podiatrist certain examinations consisting of practical demonstrations and written and oral tests. The Board has determined that the examination given by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners is at least as comprehensive and exhaustive as the tests given by the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners. The National Board of Podiatry Examiners is composed of 12 members, of whom 6 represent the Federation of Podiatry Boards, 3 represent the Council on Education of the American Podiatry Association, and 3 represent the American Association of Colleges of Podiatry. Assisting the national board in developing its examinations are 13 groups, each consisting of 3 or 4 members and including outstanding examiners or educators in various fields covered by the examinations. The national board examinations cover the following fields: anatomy, histology, embryology, bacteriology, biochemistry, chemistry, pathology, pharmacology, materia medica, physiology, dermatology, syphilology, jurisprudence, ethics, economics, orthopedics, footgear, podiatric medicine, physical medicine, therapeutics, podiatry-chiropody, hospital protocol, radiology, foot pathology, diagnosis, surgery, and anethesia. The U.S. Army and the U.S. Navy accept the national board examination in considering applications for commissions in those services. The national board program is recognized by the following States: Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The Commissioners recommend the amendment of the Podiatry Act so that the District Board of Podiatry Examiners may in its discretion, waive both the written and oral tests or either such test of an applicant for license as a podiatrist who holds a certificate from the National Board of Podiatry Examiners, providing such person successfully passes the practical examination administered by the District Board of Podiatry Examiners.

It is expected that the examination conducted by the national board is to be at least as comprehensive as that conducted by the District Board. However, since this might not always be the case, the bill requires that the District Board, in exercising its discretion in waiving the written or oral test or both such tests, satisfy itself that the examination given the applicant by the national board was at least as comprehensive as that required in the District of Columbia.

The acceptance of the examination conducted by the National Board of Podiatry Examiners will benefit the District as well as the applicant. By reason of their national character, the national board examinations have a tendency to provide a uniform and consistent measure of the qualifications of persons seeking licensure. The composition of the examination tends to reflect the teaching of the theory of podiatry on a nationwide basis. The resources in personnel and equipment available to the national board make possible the rapid evaluation and dissemination of the results of the examinations. The expense of printing the examinations, furnishing materials, securing administrators and proctors, and payment of shipping charges and all other costs involved in the testing program are sustained by the national board.

The Commissioners are informed that the District of Columbia Board of Podiatry Examiners will have complete freedom in connection with interpreting the national board grades, and that there is no objection to the District Board's supplementation of the national board's examinations with any other examination deemed necessary to fulfill District requirements.

Section 2 of the bill is intended to coordinate the proposed amendment of the act of May 23, 1918, as amended, with the requirements of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, relating to reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners anticipate no increased cost to the District as a result of the enactment of the bill.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT—QUIE OFFERS MISLEADING FIGURES TO GARNER VOTES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative QUIE, in introducing his third substitute to H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967—the bill to extend the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965—inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 20, 1967, a table purporting to show the comparative distribution of funds among States under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as now constituted and under his proposed amendment. According to Mr. QUIE, all States except New York and the District of Columbia would benefit from the block grants proposed by the Quie substitute. However, the claim of increases reflected in Mr. QUIE's table is utterly false.

The major fallacy in Representative QUIE's statistics is that he compares authorizations for the block-grant substitute with what he imagines the administration will request in appropriations for fiscal year 1969. An honest comparison of amounts States would receive under two alternative proposals should compare like with like, authorization with authorization.

The attached table compares authorizations under the Quie substitute with authorizations under the four titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which it would replace.

Several things are clear from this table. First, the $3 billion lump-sum figure in the Quie substitute is actually a substantial decrease in Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education—a cut of $281.5 million from the existing authorization.

Second, 25 States would receive substantially less money under the Quie substitute than they would receive under ESEA. The Department of Defense Overseas Schools and the Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools would be excluded altogther. The States thus hurt include all the Southern and border States, with the exception of Maryland, and some of our Nation's biggest and most populous States—New York, California, Illinois, New Jersey, and Texas, for example. It is precisely these States—States with low per-pupil expenditures for education or States with the largest numbers of educationally disadvantaged children enrolled in school—which need Federal assistance the most.

The table referred to follows:

Comparison of authorizations under H.R. 7819 as approved by the House Committee on Education and Labor and under the proposed substitute by Representative Quie (H.R. 8983), fiscal year 1969 [1]

	Committee bill	Quie bill	Net gain or loss (col. 2 minus col. 1)
United States and outlying areas	$3,281,467,883	[2]$3,000,000,000	$281,467,883
50 States and the District of Columbia	3,198,470,325	2,910,000,000	288,470,325
Alabama	106,719,767	74,984,127	31,735,640
Alaska	5,467,596	4,113,410	1,354,186
Arizona	25,664,306	30,283,668	4,619,362
Arkansas	65,786,875	39,088,258	26,698,617
California	208,855,676	206,119,222	2,736,454
Colorado	26,914,439	31,768,327	4,853,888
Connecticut	26,705,283	28,098,959	1,393,676
Delaware	6,897,339	6,390,385	506,954
Florida	94,349,862	88,597,972	5,751,890
Georgia	118,208,361	88,063,650	30,144,711
Hawaii	8,308,769	11,671,947	3,363,178
Idaho	10,360,644	14,094,094	3,733,450
Illinois	127,666,495	119,475,294	8,191,201
Indiana	55,880,401	76,079,751	20,199,350
Iowa	44,788,350	44,191,479	596,871
Kansas	30,089,487	35,134,269	5,044,782
Kentucky	87,489,613	62,954,095	24,535,518
Louisiana	97,811,654	78,535,534	19,276,120
Maine	14,643,927	17,471,949	2,828,022
Maryland	43,129,420	50,996,592	7,867,172
Massachusetts	49,776,056	60,738,670	10,962,614
Michigan	95,459,641	132,509,268	37,049,627
Minnesota	58,866,056	61,379,507	2,513,451
Mississippi	99,529,772	52,013,966	47,515,806
Missouri	$72,835,424	$64,100,525	$8,734,899
Montana	11,162,661	13,277,485	2,114,824
Nebraska	23,072,816	23,124,793	51,977
Nevada	4,197,514	4,506,765	309,251
New Hampshire	6,762,289	10,254,911	3,492,622
New Jersey	70,762,078	70,052,005	710,073
New Mexico	22,277,154	23,384,655	1,107,501
New York	286,213,671	164,309,713	121,903,958
North Carolina	150,361,444	100,797,585	49,563,859
North Dakota	14,648,447	13,340,319	1,308,128
Ohio	110,928,936	159,489,128	48,560,192
Oklahoma	47,998,215	40,586,581	7,411,634
Oregon	23,349,587	29,127,896	5,778,309
Pennsylvania	141,557,132	157,773,688	16,216,556
Rhode Island	11,097,377	11,211,904	114,527
South Carolina	89,735,037	56,841,559	32,893,478
South Dakota	16,517,657	14,122,708	2,394,949
Tennessee	103,901,688	74,748,791	29,152,897
Texas	222,871,660	198,291,363	24,580,297
Utah	10,975,409	21,925,807	10,950,398
Vermont	6,627,603	7,260,951	633,348
Virginia	89,751,592	77,159,025	12,592,567
Washington	32,580,281	43,028,933	10,448,652
West Virginia	48,384,092	36,279,296	12,104,796
Wisconsin	52,157,299	67,615,259	15,457,960
Wyoming	5,381,397	5,899,625	518,228
District of Columbia	12,992,076	6,734,337	6,257,739
Outlying areas	82,997,558	90,000,000	7,002,442

[1] Estimated authorizations based on:

Title I, estimated 5 to 17 population; low-income factor, $3,000 per annum; AFDC 1965; estimated ADA handicapped children (January 1967); estimated migratory children of migratory workers (FTE 1965); juvenile delinquents (January 1967); dependent and neglected children (January 1967); estimated children 5 to 17 in foster homes supported by public funds (January 1967); and 50 percent State or national average estimated CE per pupil in ADA 1966-67 (except migratory children). Estimated authorizations for administration are 1 percent of estimated authorization for programs or $150,000, whichever is greater. Amount for outlying areas estimated at 2½ percent 50 States and District of Columbia amount.

Title II, estimated distribution of $150,000,000 to the 50 States and District of Columbia on the basis of total public and estimated nonpublic K to 12 enrollment, fall 1966. Amount for outlying areas estimated at 3 percent of 50 States and District of Columbia amount.

Title III, estimated distribution of $500,000,000 to the 50 States and District of Columbia with a basic allotment of $200,000 and the balance distributed 50 percent on the basis of the 5 to 17 resident population, July 1, 1965, and 50 percent on the basis of total resident population, July 1, 1965. Amount for outlying areas estimated at 3 percent of 50 States and District of Columbia amount.

Title V(A), estimated distribution of $56,000,000 with 15 percent ($8,400,000) withheld for special projects, 2 percent ($952,000) of the balance withheld for outlying areas, and the remainder ($46,648,000) distributed (a) 40 percent ($18,659,200) among the States in equal amounts and (b) 60 percent ($27,988,800) distributed on the basis of the total K to 12 public school enrollment, fall 1966.

[2] Estimated distribution of $3,000,000,000 with 3 percent reserved for the outlying areas and the balance distributed on the basis of the State products of (1) fiscal year 1968-69 NDEA allotment ratios which are based on total personal income per school age (5 to 17) child for 1963, 1964, and 1965 with allotment ratio limits of 33⅓ and 66⅔ percent, and (2) estimated 5 to 17 populations, July 1, 1965.

AMERICAN TRADITION IS NOT TO "TURN TAIL AND RUN"

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, so many people are trying to tell us we have to stop the war. They burn their draft cards, they burn the flag; they do all kinds of things we used to consider only a traitor would do.

It was like seeing a new sun go up to have a telegram from one of my constituents whom I shall not name as I have not had time to contact her to ask her permission—but this is what she wired me:

> We may not "demonstrate" in public, nor make speeches with such "dramatic" embellishments as burning draft cards, but regardless we far outnumber those who advocate "peace without honor." Americans have a tradition of finishing what we do—we've never "turned tail and run," and we certainly do not want to start now.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A U.S. DIPLOMATIC ACADEMY

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill to establish a U.S. Diplomatic Academy in the Department of State to be known as the John Foster Dulles Diplomatic Academy for Peace. The courses at this academy would be designed to adequately train young men and women to become officers and employees in the diplomatic service of the United States. The courses would equal the curriculum prescribed for the granting of a baccalaureate degree, and would specifically include education and training in all aspects of communism and the science of counteraction to communism.

Mr. Speaker, the world today is a far different world than it was 100, or 50, or even 10 years ago. Scientific and technological advances have brought nations so close that distance is immaterial, and communications are instantaneous. The geography of the world has changed, and new nations have come into existence with new desires of nationalism and self-determination. All of this has exposed the great lack of knowledge and understanding of one nation of another, of the things we have in common, but more important of the differences, in needs, wants, and ideologies. We are, in effect, sitting in each others backyards, yet, with the exception of a few experts on international politics, we know very little about each other.

It is essential, now more than ever, that we concentrate our efforts on the science of peace and diplomacy—that we provide more of our people who are involved in international affairs with the special tools and methods necessary for the waging of peace through effective, skilled diplomacy. This is no less a science than that of waging war. Since 1802, when the U.S. Military Academy at West Point was established, we have trained young men in the science of war. It is just as necessary that we now establish the means to train our young people in the science of peace and all that it involves.

My bill would provide that the Secretary of State set up an academy and appoint a staff to include a superintendent, a dean of the academic board, a dean of students, and such professors needed to carry out the purposes of the act.

Students between the ages of 17 and 21 would be nominated and appointed in much the same manner as that used at our military academies and would include a certain number of students from Canada, the American Republics, and the Republic of the Philippines. An oath of allegiance would be required of all students. They would receive the same pay, allowances, and emoluments as is now provided for cadets at the U.S. Military Academy.

A Board of Visitors to the Academy, composed of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, three Senators, four Members of the House, and six persons designated by the President, would visit the Acadamy annually and submit a written report to the President and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the need for adequately trained people to meet the present and future requirements of our diplomatic service will be realized, and that my bill will be given favorable consideration.

STANISLAW MIKOLAJCZYK

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last December 13 an outstanding free world political leader, former Prime Minister of Poland Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, died in neighboring Chevy Chase, Md.

At the time of his death Mr. Mikolajczyk was serving as president of the Polish Peasant Party and was honorary president of the International Peasant Union, an organization he had organized 18 years ago.

Mr. Mikolajczyk should have died in a free Warsaw rather than an exile from the tyranny now prevailing in his homeland, Poland. Unfortunately, the power of the Soviet Army, not the will of the Polish people, prevails today behind the Iron Curtain.

The spring 1967 issue of the International Polish Union publication will be a special issue honoring this great Polish patriot and international peasant leader. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD excerpts from an article which will appear in that spring publication, written by Mr. Robert B. Soumar, managing editor.

A GREAT LEADER

Stanislaw Mikolajczyk was born in German Westphalia, but he spent half of his unusually interesting and tense life living abroad. Perhaps his love of his nation grew even greater as a result of having to pass so many years outside of Poland. His father was a miner in Westphalia. As a child, Mikolajczyk's parents told him about the land of his forefathers. The stories seemed like fairy tales, and he dreamed of the day he could return to his people and to the land. This dream soon came true. His family went back to the German-held Poznan province and bought a small farm. At last they possessed a piece of Polish land. Throughout his life Mikolajczyk was concerned with the problems of the Polish village. The problems of the Polish village paralleled the aims of the Polish nation: to live again in an independent and democratic Poland, where the Polish peasant, the backbone of Polish patriotism, could live freely and with dignity.

Mikolajczyk died in the United States. But thousands of miles away, millions of peasants from the Baltic to the Adriatic prayed fervently for the peace of his soul. In defiance of the communist government, these people, yearning for freedom, celebrated masses for Mr. Mikolajczyk in cities and villages throughout Poland. For East Central European people, Mikolajczyk remains a symbol of the unending peasant struggle against communism and for peasantry's political, economic and social freedom. East Central European peasants feel, however, that the death of the valiant leader is an immense and irreparable loss for the people and for the cause of their liberty.

Besides paying tribute and honor to the great statesman, the free world press emphasized Mikolajczyk's tragedy: his lifelong struggle for a free and democratic Poland, and a better lot for Polish and world peasantry—a struggle still unfinished at his death.

At the end of World War I the young Mikolajczyk fought as a volunteer in the revolutionary struggle for independent Poland. Two years later he fought the Bolshevik invaders.

Although his prewar political ascendancy in Poland was rapid and spectacular, his major role in Polish and world politics came during World War II.

WORLD WAR II

1939. Again it was a fateful hour for Poland. As an enlisted soldier, Mikolajczyk defended his country against Nazi hordes. From the defeated Poland, he made his way to Paris where he assumed the duties of Vice-President and Acting President of the Polish National Council (Polish Parliament) in exile. The President of the Council was the famous piano virtuoso and great Polish patriot, Ignace Paderewski.

After the defeat of France, Mikolajczyk reached Great Britain and became a Vice-Premier and Minister of the Interior of General Sikorski's Polish government in London. When General Sikorski was killed in the Gibraltar plane crash in 1943, Mikolajczyk became the Polish Government's Prime Minister. He headed the government during the war period, a very crucial period for Poland. In its obituary on Mikolajczyk the London Times praised his balanced judgment and democratic views, and went on to note the high esteem in which he was held by the allied leaders.

As Prime Minister of the London Polish government, Mikolajczyk was faced with great moral responsibility. It was the Polish nation that first took arms against Nazi aggression and with unbelievable bravery and terrible human and material sacrifices continued to fight the occupation forces. Hun-

dreds of thousands of Polish guerrillas harassed the German army. Millions of Poles had been massacred and Mikolajczyk was sending Polish divisions to fight side by side with victorious Allied armies. But what would be the recompense for all these sacrifices on the part of the Polish people? Would their own allies deprive them of the taste of victory? Would they be deprived of the right to rebuild an independent Polish state? Mikolajczyk faced such a situation and the coming events filled him with alarm.

The tension between two uneasy allies—Poland and Soviet Russia—was rising and the unfortunate fate of Eastern Central Europe was already taking shape. Exiled Poles in London were facing a very difficult situation and Mikolajczyk's political struggle extended to a multitude of fronts. Soviet Russia, then Poland's war ally, had made a pact with the Nazis only a few years earlier in which Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia agreed to eliminate the Polish state and divide it between themselves. There was the tragedy of the Katyn massacre of 10,000 Polish officers by the Soviets. Then came the fateful Warsaw uprising against the retreating Nazi army so cruelly sabotaged by Stalin. A quarter of a million Polish people—the cream of Polish democratic leadership—perished in Warsaw. and the city remained a mass of ruins.

It became very clear that the Soviets were playing a false game. Mikolajczyk's government and the Polish people ceased to be masters of the destiny of their country. The Western allies were defending their own interests and were blind to the fact that their interests were exactly parallel to the interests of Poland and other East Central European nations. Mikolajczyk, in spite of all reverses, struggled heroically to keep Poland, just liberated from the Nazis by the Red Army, from becoming a communist state.[1] Before the Yalta Conference he went to Washington and pleaded with President Roosevelt, warning him of the new Soviet danger. He was in frequent contact with Churchill and went to Moscow twice to see and negotiate with Stalin.

The major issue at the notorious 1945 Yalta Conference dealing with the East European question was the problem of Poland. Poland and Mikolajczyk were the focal points of controversy between Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin. For Stalin the problem was clear: victory for Mikolajczyk would mean a democratic Poland and the defeat of Stalin in his plans to communize Eastern Central Europe. President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill finally yielded to Stalin's stubborn stand and Mikolajczyk, his London government and the Polish nation lost. At Churchill's insistence, Stalin agreed that Mikolajczyk could be a member of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity dominated by the communist so-called "Lublin Committee". In his memoirs Churchill said that the Lublin Poles were mere pawns of the Russians; yet he urged Mikolajczyk to join the provisional government.[2]

[1] When Mikolajczyk escaped from Poland in 1947 he described his struggle for independent Poland in his book: "The Rape of Poland", published in the U.S.A. and translated into a number of languages. Churchill, commenting to Mikolajczyk on the book, declared: "You wrote bitter things about me, but I cannot say that all of these were not true. My duty was to advise you from the point of view of British interests, and you had a choice to follow the advice or not." Churchill's remark was quite cynical, but such remarks are often the rule in international politics.

[2] The Yalta agreements and Mikolajczk's and Poland's tragedy were extensively reported in postwar literature. Churchill in his war memoirs and Mikolajczyk in his book "The Rape of Poland" dealt with the problem thoroughly.

Mikolajczyk finally consented to go to Poland. He knew the danger of his enterprise only too well. During the War the Polish underground helped his son to escape from a Nazi concentration camp and smuggled him to London. Mikolajczyk's wife spent the war in Nazi concentration camps. She was finally liberated by the American army and came to London. Mikolajczyk left his wife and son in Great Britain and went alone to Poland to lead the struggle against the communists.[3]

RETURN TO POSTWAR POLAND

In the communist-dominated coalition government, Mikolajczyk became Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture. His return to Poland was the return of a glorious son and saviour. He became a legendary figure, a symbol for all the forces that wanted to save Poland from communism. The communists were a small group of conspirators. But all the physical and moral strength of the Polish nation was powerless against them. Although Mikolajczyk's popularity was immense and he had behind him a powerful peasant party which represented the great majority of voters, Mikolajczyk soon realized that he could not control the instruments of power. As in other parts of Eastern Central Europe, the communists, following the classical advice of Lenin, took over all power-controlling positions in the government. The masters of Poland were the Soviet Army and police, and the Polish communists who controlled the Polish army and police and the administration of the country.

Mikolajczyk also realized that as a member of a communist-dominated coalition government, his hands were tied. Violence and subversion were the communist tools in the election campaign. The outcome of the 1947 elections was falsified by the communists. In protest, Mikolajczyk resigned as a member of government and went into resolute open opposition. In doing so, he was attempting the impossible. In exposing the communists as traitors to Poland, he became at the same time an outspoken critic of the Soviet takeover. The communist terror, the burning of villages, the arrests, intimidation and even murder of his most active supporters made Mikolajczyk's position less and less tenable. He fought the Red tide until it overwhelmed Poland in the fall of 1947. When he learned that he was to be arrested and executed, Mikolajczyk escaped to the West. His flight was the only alternative to awaiting a death sentence from a Polish military court.

[3] From the great number of letters of sympathy sent to Mr. Mikolajczyk's son, Marian, and to the International Peasant Union, the letter of W. Averell Harriman, U.S. Ambassador-at-Large is pertinent to the above-mentioned problem:

DECEMBER 15, 1966.

DEAR MR. MIKOLAJCZYK: I am distressed to learn of your father's death. I have known and worked with your father since the days in London, first when he was Deputy Prime Minister under General Sikorski and later as Prime Minister of the Polish Government in exile. I have ever been impressed by his courage, patriotism and devotion to his ideals.

We went through many trying times together in Moscow attempting to negotiate with Stalin an agreement for the independence of Poland. Unhappily none succeeded. I saw him just before he left Moscow to go to Warsaw to assume the position of Deputy Prime Minister in the coalition government. He told me then that although he had grave concern over the good faith of the Soviets and of the Polish communists, and feared that the attempt at a coalition would not work, he felt that the chance had to be taken for the possible protection of the freedom of the Polish people. He told me as I said goodbye and wished him well, "You may never see me again."

He escaped before he was arrested and carried on gallantly, loyal to his commitments to his people.

I greatly valued my association with him over the years and will ever respect his memory. He exemplified the finest qualities of Polish gallantry.

I send you and the members of your family my deepest sympathy in your great loss.

Sincerely,

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN.

MIKOLAJCZYK IN EXILE

In 1948, Mikolajczyk, reunited with his wife and son in London, chose Washington, D.C. as the seat of his manifold activities. After his arrival in the United States, he wrote a series of 40 articles entitled: "The Coming Russian Terror", which was published by more than 200 newspapers in both Americas, Europe and Asia. He wrote a book, "The Rape of Poland" which has been published in a number of languages.

Mikolajczyk organized his Polish Peasant Party in exile with regional organizations in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Germany, Scandinavia, Switzerland and later in Latin America and Australia. All these organizations, along with the peasant underground in Poland are still a very active homogeneous body, and Mikolajczyk's program continues to be its moral and political guide.

In 1948 Mr. Mikolajczyk was elected the first President of the International Peasant Union, an exile organization of agrarian parties from ten Soviet-captive countries. In 1950 he became President of the Polish National Democratic Committee.

PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEASANT UNION

It is difficult to describe in only a few lines those sixteen years of effort by the indefatigable President of the International Peasant Union. He was a tireless and eloquent spokesman against communist tyranny, a staunch advocate for the cause of democracy and the unity of nations in East Central Europe.

The International Peasant Union was formed twenty years ago with an impressive, European-wide organization. Its central office was in Washington, D.C., but branch offices were located in New York, London, Paris, Rome and Munich and, in addition, there were regional councils in other European cities. The free world press and democratic political organizations welcomed the enterprise with great interest. The vehement reaction of the communists and immediate attacks on the organization underscored its importance.

The prewar predecessor of the I.P.U. was the International Agrarian Bureau in Prague, popularly known as "Green International". Members included agrarian parties from nineteen European nations. The peasant parties' organized prewar struggle against communism and any form of unrepresentative dictatorial government was a valuable heritage for the new organization. It gave the International Peasant Union the needed prestige in the free world.

Mr. Mikolajczyk, as the President of the International Peasant Union, assisted by Dr. George M. Dimitrov, its Secretary General, members of the organization's Central Committee, political representatives, officials and I.P.U. publications, made full use of this political advantage. Enriched by his postwar experiences in Poland, where he fought so bravely against communists, he was the leader best qualified to stir resistance behind the Iron Curtain. Mikolajczyk was largely responsible for organizing the Polish resistance to communism and it is a movement which is still dramatically alive.

The I.P.U. brought the message and knowl-

edge of conditions behind the Iron Curtain to those in the free world, and especially to developing nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America, who were in danger of becoming victims of communism.

Since its foundation, the International Peasant Union's main objective has been and still is to help the East Central European people to freedom. Broadcasts to countries behind the Iron Curtain have greatly helped the morale of the resisting peasantry. The organization developed an extensive publication activity. Bulletins, documents, booklets, memoranda and manifestos addressed to peasants of Asia, Africa and Latin America in English, French, German and Italian were sent to 22 overseas countries. Conferences and round-table discussionss dealing with problems of communism, the democratization of Eastern Central Europe and the reconstruction of its agriculture, have been held in various parts of the free world. Naturally the organization participated in the efforts of the European Movement. Representatives of the International Peasant Union have been speakers at the Congresses of International Federation of Agricultural Producers and Confederation of European Agriculture.

The I.P.U. Congresses are held each second year in various cities of the United States and Europe. They are attended by free world political leaders from the United States, Europe and Asia.

Mr. Mikolajczyk and the International Peasant Union were ceaselessly attacked by the communists. It is the best proof of his and the organization's popularity among the Soviet captive nations from the Baltic to the Adriatic.

Mikolajczyk was often attacked in the free world as well, mostly by those who failed to understand the problems and dangers of communism. Ten years ago, the situation in Poland was explosive. There was the Poznan uprising, and evidence of unrest in Hungary (which later became a revolution). When Gomulka came to power in Poland, the Western world was unduly optimistic, hoping that miracles would happen and that freedom for the East European people was just around the corner. While preparing for the memorable Fifth Congress of the International Peasant Union in Paris, (the Congress was held during the Hungarian Revolution) Mikolajczyk warned that credit for the upheaval in Poland should go to the resisting Polish nation. No credit should go to the Polish Communist Party, nor to Gomulka. "Gomulka was put in power in Poland to save Poland for communism and for the Soviets," declared Mikolajczyk. For this evaluation of the situation in Poland, Mikolajczyk was strongly attacked by the West and by Polish exiles. But Mikolajczyk knew Gomulka well. Gomulka saved Poland for communism and no other communist leader is so trusted in Moscow. Gomulka became a counselor on all major international moves of the Soviet leaders. This is one example of how Mikolajczyk faced the reality of a situation, and, when attacked by East or West, relied upon his own moral strength.

DID MIKOLAJCZYK FIGHT IN VAIN?

When he decided to join the coalition government led by the communists—as related heretofore—he knew very well that he had little chance of saving Poland for democracy. Only his great courage, immense popularity in Poland and love for his people led him to try his chances in post-war Poland.

But Mikolajczyk, in his two and a half years of a really heroic struggle showed the Polish people the way. Helped by the Catholic Church, he organized the peasants' resistance into a force which still miraculously opposes its enslavement. The communists were unable to force the peasants into collectives and the peasantry is at present the backbone of the Catholic Church's remarkable resistance to communism. Could the collectivized peasants support so staunchly the present successful Church resistance against communist regime? Certainly not.

MIKOLAJCZYK'S FAREWELL

Even in the final months of his life when he was gravely ill, the fate of his people was uppermost in Mikolajczyk's mind: In celebration of the millennium of Poland's Christianity, his broadcast to the Polish people shortly before his death echoed grief and melancholy over the fate of his country and his hope for its better future.

Mikolajczyk spoke with unusual emotion:

"This year we celebrate a rare occasion—a millennium of Christian Poland. A millennium is a very long period of time. Many generations have passed. Our nation has lived through great victories and disasters, ascents and falls, pride and shame, dignity and humiliation, joy and suffering, hope and despair. Thus the centuries have formed and shaped our national character and our national spirit within the framework of Christian principles and ideology. . .

"The reception of Christianity in Poland was a very wise move on the part of Mieszko I. It protected Poland from extermination by Germany and opened the way to progress and civilization—a civilization in which the Church played a large role. . .

"My people of Christian Poland, wherever fate has thrown you, no matter how bitter your life is, no matter what work you do or will do, do not be led astray by the Communist hypocrites. Always try to learn the truth at its source and not from lying Communist propaganda. Persevere by the side of your leaders; leaders who fight for the freedom of Poland in difficulty and danger. . .

"A free Poland will rise, and a free people will undertake to build a just motherland for all her children. And in this Poland, the people will create a "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people", as Abraham Lincoln did for the American people. Happiness and joy will return to our country. The nightmare of Communist tyranny will disappear and man will once again become his neighbor's brother. . .

"The Green Banners, decorated with the picture of Our Lady of Czestochowa that are denied to us today, will again flutter over Polish soil. The work-hardened hands of the peasants will again lower the banners to honor those who risked their lives and fought with dignity for freeedom and justice. . .

"The Peasant Festival in Poland was always a great day. Hundreds of thousands of peasants, carrying green banners adorned with images of Mary, the Mother of God, and carrying golden ears of wheat and clover, flocked to the churches all over Poland.

"Joy filled the hearts of the peasant masses. Despite want and distress, the breath of spring and the sight of nature awakening to a new life brought hope to their hearts. The peasant huts were decorated with bundles of sweet flag and the fragrance of meadows' flowers filled the air. . .

"I am speaking to you with joy . . ."

But Mikolajczyk's voice was feeble and broken, and the broadcast was his last message to his people. Last December 13th Mikolajczyk's heart failed and the struggle of the great Polish patriot came to an end. The masses which were celebrated for Mikolajczyk all over Poland were the message of the Polish people that Mikolajczyk's heritage remains the Voice of Free Poland.

Mr. Speaker, this great patriot for the cause of freedom, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, did not see, within his lifetime, the fulfillment of this dream of restoration of freedom to Poland and other enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain but he left a rich legacy. The memory of his personal sacrifice and perseverance will remain an inspiration to the millions of people still struggling to end the tyranny of communism.

May he rest in peace. May his memory be honored for all those who continue the great struggle for freedom. May the Lord bless and keep him.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, H.R. 9036, to be known as the Social Security Amendments of 1967. This bill provides for an 8-percent across-the-board benefit increase retroactive to January 1 of this year. This is the maximum amount possible without the addition of further burdens on wage earners through an increase in the payroll tax.

The bill also contains an automatic increase in benefits to compensate for advances in cost of living. Since wage increases usually precede or are coexistent with advances in other cost-of-living factors, the gain in additional covered workers near the maximum social security wage base would not necessitate increase in cost as a level percentage of payroll. My bill provides that whenever the Consumer Price Index rises by 3 percent or more in a calendar quarter, there would be a corresponding increase in benefit income.

To encourage recipients to help themselves through outside earnings, H.R. 9036 would raise the allowable outside earnings from $1,500 to $2,400 a year without loss of social security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now because our senior citizens have watched their fixed pensions, annuities, savings, and social security benefits shrink in purchasing power because of inflation. This plan will allow for a realistic increase in benefits without further jeopardizing the financial integrity of the system.

BILL FOR SVETLANA NOW UNNECESSARY

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the good—though somewhat tardy—judgment of the State Department in admitting Svetlana Stalina to the United States on a temporary but indefinite visa has now made academic my private bill

to grant her political asylum. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have written the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee indicating that further action on H.R. 7600 is unnecessary.

Many of us in the Congress felt that when Miss Stalina requested asylum in the United States, it should have been automatically extended to her. Certainly this action would have been in keeping with our traditions.

To have denied her refuge in the United States might have had unpleasant consequences if at some future time another controversial figure in a Communist country sought asylum in the United States. Miss Stalina may have no wish to be a pawn in the cold war and her wishes should be respected. To make a circus out of her decision to leave the Soviet Union would not go unnoticed among those who seek solitude in their asylum.

I would not want this opportunity to pass without expressing my personal appreciation to George Kennan, who volunteered to serve as intermediary between Miss Stalina and our State Department. Ambassador Kennan has performed outstanding service to this Nation in his 40-year career as a member of the Foreign Service. At one time he was our Ambassador to the Soviet Union and later to Yugoslavia. His major contribution to our foreign policy was the doctrine of containment which he proposed to the President in 1948. In volunteering for this difficult responsibility, he demonstrated again his willingness to serve the best interest of the United States.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Legislature has directed that its resolution urging the reconsideration and amendment of the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965, Senate Journal Resolution 21, be brought to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

With the permission of this body, I am attaching the official notification of this action, signed by William P. Nugent, chief clerk of the Wisconsin Senate, and a copy of the Wisconsin Legislature's joint resolution, and I respectfully include them to be printed in full:

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE,
SENATE CHAMBER,
Madison, April 18, 1967.

Hon. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHADEBERG: Upon direction of the Wisconsin State Legislature I am transmitting to you a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 21, memorializing Congress to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-285) for the purpose of making it more flexible and workable.

This Resolution was adopted by both Houses of the Wisconsin Legislature.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk, Senate.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

Memorializing Congress to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-285) for the purpose of making it more flexible and workable

The legislature of the state of Wisconsin enthusiastically approves and is desirous of co-operating in carrying out the general plan for roadside beautification under the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965, the objectives of which are primarily the same as Wisconsin's long established and continuing program to construct and maintain highways that serve and attract our resident population and many tourist guests. Nevertheless after careful study it appears that the means and methods prescribed by the act for achieving its goals, including the proposed rules and standards for its administration, not only completely change or nullify historic Wisconsin methods of controlling roadside outdoor advertising, but pose an economic and financial impact so adverse to highway construction and roadside control in Wisconsin as to make compliance therewith untenable; and, on the other hand, noncompliance therewith will result in a severe retardation of the Wisconsin highway construction and improvement program. The reasons for this are patent.

Heretofore and for many years in Wisconsin, billboards, junk yards and unsightly structures along the interstate highway system have been controlled by legislative zoning under the police power. The Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 requires that states conforming to the act must control the same along both the interstate and federal primary systems, and fails to permit an exemption for local control within incorporated areas, thereby increasing the number of miles which would have to be controlled in Wisconsin from about 460 to 6,000 miles, affecting approximately 44,000 billboards and 451 junk yards. It further requires that such controls must be exercised not later than January 1, 1968, by removing about 40,000 of these billboards, which would be rendered illegal under the federal act, upon payment of just compensation to the owners thereof and also to the owners of the land on which they are maintained, and by screening and landscaping the junk yards or, in the alternative when that cannot be done successfully, removing them after just compensation has been paid to the owners.

This in itself would be an insurmountable undertaking by the state, but the real dilemma is that the cost of such control program will approximate $20,000,000 of which Wisconsin will have to pay one fourth, and that the entire $5,000,000 plus an undeterminable amount for future cost of such controls will be diverted from construction of Wisconsin highways to the beautification program. Not included in these figures are the undetermined amounts necessary to control areas where no signs presently exist or for signs installed after the passage of this act on October 22, 1965.

Another unpalatable phase of the federal act is that if a state conforming thereto fails to meet the deadline or elects not to conform in effecting such controls it will forfeit 10% of its otherwise allotted federal highway construction aids annually until it complies.

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That for the purpose of seeking to improve the workability of the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 to make the act sufficiently flexible to better recognize the variations in conditions between states, to minimize so far as practicable the wholesale nullification or revision of historic state legislation governing control of roadside billboards and junk yards, to give the right to exempt control within incorporated areas, to give states further time in which to meet deadlines for accomplishing effective control of roadside billboards and junk yards, and to enable states to exercise control over roadside billboards and junk yards by legislative zoning under the police power as an alternative to condemnation or payment of damages, the legislature of the state of Wisconsin memorializes the Congress of the United States to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 accordingly; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each house of the Congress and to each Wisconsin member thereof.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

This Joint Resolution requests the Congress of the United States to reconsider and amend the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 for the purpose of making it more flexible to meet the conditions of the several states and particularly to enable states to control roadside advertising and junk yards by legislation instead of paying damages for removal thereof and to extend deadlines for accomplishing effective control of advertising and junk yards along federal highways under the act.

KAREN PESARESI, MANHATTAN, KANS., NAMED 1967 ALL-AMERICAN HOMEMAKER OF TOMORROW

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, it was a proud day for Kansas last Thursday when Miss Karen Pesaresi, an 18-year-old high school senior from Manhattan, Kans., was named the 1967 Betty Crocker All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow.

Karen was chosen from an original field of 580,000 senior girls representing nearly 15,000 of the Nation's high schools. She became the State finalist for Kansas and competed with 50 other winners representing each State and the District of Columbia. She will receive a $5,000 scholarship from General Mills, the sponsor of the program.

It was my pleasure to meet Karen and her teacher chaperone, Mrs. Tyra Davis, last week when a reception was held in Washington for the 51 finalists. They then went to Colonial Williamsburg, Va., where Karen's selection as the All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow was announced.

All those who met Karen and visited with her at the reception know that this honor went to a deserving young lady. She will wear her title well and she will be an inspiration to all other young ladies who see homemaking as one of the greatest of callings a woman can follow. My colleagues and I salute her and wish her well as she becomes

even better qualified as a homemaking expert through her studies at Kansas State University in her hometown of Manhattan.

In order that all my colleagues can know about the sterling qualities of Karen Pesaresi, I include with my remarks an account of her background and training which appeared in the Manhattan, Kans., Mercury.

The account follows:

The 1967 All-American Homemaker of Tomorrow is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Karl Pesaresi, 810 Moro, Manhattan. She has two brothers, Karl, 20, and Walter, 16. An honor student throughout junior and senior high school at Manhattan High, she ranks in the upper five percent of her class of 331, has participated in numerous extra-curricular activities—including Future Homemakers of Tomorrow and several musical activities and groups—and represented her school at Kansas Girls State.

Music plays a big part in her life. She has taken piano lessons for 11 years, teaches piano herself, and is a three-time superior winner at the National Federation of Music Clubs Junior Division Festivals. She has also received "one" ratings at the State Music Festival.

In addition to other piano work, she sings in Manhattan High's "Pops" Choir—a select group of 23 boys and girls—and in the school's Robed Choir and the First Presbyterian Church choir, and is a violinist in the school orchestra. She has been awarded three music scholarships to the Sherwood Music School Summer Seminars in Chicago.

Miss Pesaresi lists cooking—"even though I used to hate being in the kitchen"—housecleaning, and sewing as her favorite homemaking duties. She has been making many of her own clothes in recent years.

Elaborating on her feeling that good management is a homemaker's greatest asset, she says, "A woman in the home must be well-organized and able to manage everything from time to money to energy. If, in addition, she has a career, the problem of management increases. The well-organized homemaker will be an asset to her family and friends."

Miss Pesaresi has been saving most of the money she earns through piano teaching and her part-time job at a dress store for her education. She plans to major in home economics at Kansas State University, and go on to graduate school. Her choice of a major was influenced by what she describes as the "practicality" of a home economist.

National awards in the annual Betty Crocker Search for the American Homemaker of Tomorrow, now in its 13th year, are made on the basis of scores in a written homemaking knowledge and attitude examination taken by all participants in early December and personal observation and interviews of state winners during an Eastern tour climaxed by the awards dinner. This year's tour included Washington, D.C., and Colonial Williamsburg.

MRS. TOM BUCHANAN, WASHINGTON, KANS., NAMED TOP KANSAS WOMAN JOURNALIST OF THE YEAR

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, it pleased me to note that Mrs. Tom Buchanan of Washington, Kans., has been named the Kansas Woman Journalist of the Year by the Kansas State University chapter of Theta Sigma Phi, national honorary society for women in journalism.

Mrs. Buchanan is a columnist and a part-time assistant on her husband's paper, the Washington County News. She was chosen by previous winners of the award and received the recognition for her accomplishments in community and writing fields.

Mrs. Buchanan has combined the raising of a family of five children with her newspaper work. She has previously received the first place award in a National Federation of Press Women feature story contest and has also won the group's award for editorials, news stories, publicity, her weekly column, and for advertising writing.

The Kansas Woman Journalist of the Year graduated with honors from Sterling College in 1950 where she was editor of the yearbook and president of the student government board.

Knowing Mrs. Buchanan and how she has reared her fine family, while at the same time making a significant contribution to journalism in Washington County and the State of Kansas, I join in recognizing her for her achievements. I commend Theta Sigma Phi for naming her Kansas Woman Journalist of the Year.

PROTECT FISHERIES RESOURCES OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to protect the fisheries resources of the Continental Shelf from indiscriminate use of underwater explosives. As presently written, the law requires private firms who want to conduct underwater seismic tests for purposes of oil exploration, to obtain a license from the Secretary of the Interior. The job of the Secretary is to see that marine life and other marine resources are adequately protected while the search for oil goes on.

A disturbing gap in the law, Mr. Speaker, is the omission of Government agencies from the requirement of permission from the Secretary. Agencies such as the National Science Foundation, it appears, could conduct underwater blasting for experimental purposes, without any concern for fish and shellfish resources in the area. Since the Secretary of Interior has been given responsibility in our Government for protection and development of all underwater resources, it seems only fitting that the law should apply to public agencies as well as private.

While it would not interfere with the military departments in their carrying out of overriding defense responsibilities, my bill would bring other Government agencies under the supervisory authority of the Secretary of the Interior. Licenses would be issued to these agencies for underwater seismic work on the same basis, and under the same protection, as they are to private firms. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this measure will serve to promote development of new underwater riches, while conserving and protecting those which we already have.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9062

A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require certain agencies of the United States to obtain authorization from the Secretary of the Interior before undertaking geological and geophysical explorations in the outer Continental Shelf

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1340) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Any agency of the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "Any military department of the United States, any other department, agency, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the United States government authorized by the Secretary,"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "As used in this section, 'military department' means the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the Coast Guard.".

PRIVATE PENSION PROGRAMS

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for many years, public and private policy has been concerned with the welfare of the American worker and his family, both during and after he has completed his working life. Concern in providing financial support for the aged has been exemplified in our country through the development of various institutional arrangements, the most prominent and well known of which is the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, which is more commonly known as social security. Over nine out of 10 workers, totaling over 80 million persons, are now covered or eligible for coverage. Over 90 percent of the persons now turning 65 are eligible for benefits and this figure has been increasing yearly. Up to date, social security has been successful in carrying out the intent evidenced by the Congress in providing a basic floor of protection to assure the aged worker and his family of freedom from want.

One of the greatest developments in our post-World War II economy has been the tremendous expansion and acceptance of the idea of personal income spreading. Income spreading consists of taking the income a person is likely to receive during his lifetime and spreading it forward for expenditure purposes to the earlier years from the anticipated earning years and spreading it backward

for expenditure, again from the earning years to the years of retirement. It consists of taking the income during the earning years and pooling it with other people's income against the common risks to income stability which may result from misfortune such as a premature death, or a debilitating accident or sickness. Finally, it consists of permitting erratic income resulting from the nature of a man's talents and hence to his type of employment to be "equalized" in respect to the Federal income tax's graduated rates.

All of these factors which bear upon income spreading have seen remarkable development in the post-World War II years in our society. Pensions and retirement systems are examples of spreading income into the future from the earning years to the years of retirement. Insurance, whether it is life insurance, health insurance, accident insurance, or otherwise, illustrates the pooling and spreading of income to protect against common risks. Consumer credit, which is in essence a post-World War II development, is an example of spreading income forward in anticipation of later earnings. Consumer credit, I might add, is finally being recognized, as it should be, as a method of saving in itself, as well as a means of providing the needs at the time they are needed of the new and young families for the home and consumer durables. I might digress a little further to point out that consumer credit for education, which on a large scale is a relatively new development, is one of the wisest capital expenditures a person can make based on his anticipated future earnings.

Congress, to a large extent, has followed the obviously sound policy that the workers of this country should be encouraged to adequately provide for their superannuation beyond the basic floor provided by social security to the extent that each person feels is reasonably adequate for his particular circumstances, through a combination of personal thrift and investment, through insurance, and through private retirement programs. In 1942, Congress provided an impetus for private retirement plans by clarifying the tax treatment of such plans in the Internal Revenue Code. In the years following, business and labor responded with great initiative. Today well over 25 million people are covered under private pension plans, and estimates are that by 1980 total coverage will exceed 42 million employees. Equally important is the growth that private pension plans have experienced. In 1950 less than 10 million employees were covered in plans with some $12 billion in assets. Today, the assets of these plans are approaching $90 billion.

The retired employee is now assured of greater independence in the twilight of his life, with greater freedom of choice as to where he lives, how he spends his money and the manner in which he lives. Employers benefit through higher worker morale and an expanded market for goods and services among the retired. The working employee has a greater sense of security, both in terms of his retirement years and in terms of the knowledge that he can devote the fruits of his labor today to the education and development of his family, knowing that his elders are more secure. But on top of all this, the Nation's elderly are becoming a more positive force in the economy rather than placing a burden upon it, particularly to the extent that the retirement programs derive their benefit payments from invested savings and their earnings. Further, these savings provide the financing for a great deal of the economic growth in the society.

Private retirement programs were given a further boost with the passage of H.R. 10, which represents the culmination of the efforts of my former colleague from New York, Mr. Keogh, and others to extend private retirement-plan coverage to a group consisting of 20 million self-employed and their employees on a basis comparable to that offered those employees by others.

Today, the capabilities of the private sector to provide adequate income spreading programs to accommodate our elderly citizens is being seriously challenged on several fronts. Like many of the highly successful accomplishments of our society, the rapid growth of private pension programs has been accompanied by certain difficulties, not the least of which is the entrance of the Federal Government into the retirement field. The administration is presently pushing proposals in social security which would encroach upon an area which can be more capably handled by the private sector and which, being a pay-as-you-go system, can neither provide the same amount of benefits nor the pool of savings to finance future economic growth for the society that the private funded programs can.

The President has requested increases in social security benefits averaging some 20 percent and corresponding increases in supporting payroll taxes. These benefit increases far exceed the increase required to keep pace with inflation. The President's proposal would therefore greatly expand social security as a retirement program. It would break the traditional and sounder policy that social security provide merely a base or floor income in retirement years. If implemented, it could be the first step toward the development of social security alone as a complete retirement program, substantially supplanting private savings and private pension programs. If there were no better way to provide for the retirement of our senior citizens, I would favor the expansion of our social security program to do the job. It can be a fundamentally sound system for providing income assurance against indigency among the aged. However, it has, even today, grown beyond its original purpose of protecting against and eliminating indigency past 65 and in the process changed some of its basic assumptions and so endangered its fundamental soundness.

The expansion of the social security program can be justified neither on the basis of providing more adequate retirement for the aged nor on the basis that it is a welfare program. There are better and more appropriate vehicles for both of these purposes. Social security cannot properly be developed as a welfare program as it does not incorporate a true needs test. As such, it justifies its benefits on the basis of the needs of a few. This is the basis on which the program has expanded through the years; it is the basis on which Medicare was added to social security.

By pushing social security further into the retirement business, the greater efficiency and flexibility that attach to pension or retirement programs in the private sector are ignored. The returns to the individual per dollar contributed, both by himself and his employer, are greater under a private program than under social security or any other Government retirement program. The money funded in the private programs is more efficiently managed and more wisely and fruitfully invested. Funding is in fact absent from the social security system. The funds on hand are barely sufficient to meet benefit payments for 1 year. Such funding as does exist in Government programs can only be invested in sterile rather than living investments; namely, Government bonds. Further, there is a healthy competition among fund trustees and fund managers. There is a healthy competition among companies and among unions to provide better benefits under more imaginative programs. This competition works continuously to improve private programs.

Other challenges to the operations of the private pension programs are directed at specific aspects of the programs. Criticisms have been directed principally at funding policies among the programs, at vesting and portability provisions in the plans, at the management and financial policies and practices followed in administering the plans, and at the insurance or lack of insurance for plan participants against the loss of vested rights from the termination of pension plans or from the loss of fund investments.

In January of 1965, the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds submitted a report on private employee retirement plans. The report suggested a need to regulate the specific terms of the pension arrangement between the employer and employee on the basis that the present arrangements did not properly protect the participant's rights under pension plans and tended to reduce labor mobility. The report contended that inadequate vesting and portability provisions in many plans tended to tie the worker to his employer and subjected him to the loss of his pension if his employment should terminate either voluntarily or involuntarily. The report contended that many plans were inadequately funded and did not provide the participants with sufficient insurance against loss due to the termination of plans.

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress held hearings in April and May of 1966 on private pension plans. The subcommittee delved extensively into the specific provisions of many of the large pension plans and heard further testimony from Government officials. The subcommittee notably did not hear directly from representatives of the many

smaller pension plans and did not hear from the various banks, insurance companies, and so on who act as trustees of fund assets. During the hearings, Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, indicated that his Department was conducting a number of research projects relating to private pension plans and including studies on the funding of the plans, the reasons for the termination of private plans, and other areas.

As a result of the Joint Economic Committee hearings, the committee staff prepared a report, entitled "Old Age Income Assurance: An Outline of Issues and Alternatives," which suggested as a primary alternative some rather radical departures from our present public policy on retirement programs, which now provides for a limited or base social security "retirement" system with a superimposed structure of private programs. The report suggested that this present setup be replaced by a needs-related program, which would convert the existing tax exclusions and exemptions for the aged to tax credit equivalents and would eliminate the public assistance payments we have now, and by a work-related program comprising a two-tier social security program consisting of a basic compulsory plan and a voluntary supplementary plan. The tax credit idea is intended to provide the aged with a guaranteed annual income. Private pension programs could merge under the proposal with the Government-run voluntary supplemental plan or operate independently but preferably under Government regulations similar to those recommended by the President's Committee.

Hearings were held in March of 1965 by the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes of the Senate Special Committee on Aging relating to the extension of private pension plan coverage. As a result of the hearings, the subcommittee reported their findings and made a number of recommendations on the extension of private pension plans. Most of the recommendations dealt with amendments to the tax laws covering the self-employed. Some of these recommendations were incorporated in the Keogh bill. The subcommittee also recommended consideration of the recommendations of the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds in the light of their effect in promoting the expansion of private plans and recommended that the President's Committee study ways in which private pension plans may be extended.

A few months ago, the Treasury Department issued proposed new regulations—announcement 66–58—governing the qualifications of private pension plans for tax deductions on corporate contributions made under the plans. Most significantly the proposed regulations provided for a new formula for integrating private programs with social security. Under the new formula, many companies would be required to pay either larger pensions to those with low incomes or provide for reduced pensions for those with moderate and high incomes. Because of the large number of comments received on the proposed regulations, the Treasury Department formed an advisory committee in January of this year to study the problem further.

More recently, President Johnson proposed that the financial administration of the private plans be regulated and included this proposal in his message on consumer protection. Also, a rather comprehensive bill was introduced in the Senate on February 28 by Senator JAVITS, which would establish a Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission to administer provisions establishing minimum standards and regulations on vesting, funding, management, and reinsurance, and creating a voluntary program on portability.

A number of other bills relating to private pension plans have been introduced in the 90th Congress including S. 69 which provides for a study of pension portability, H.R. 686 which provides for the insurance of private pension benefits, H.R. 688 and S. 186 which deal with the tax benefits on pension plan contributions, H.R. 692 and S. 1255 which relate to reporting under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, H.R. 4462 which would require the vesting of benefits in private pension plans within 10 years, H.R. 1119 which requires the submission of records relating to pension plan stock purchases, and S. 1024 which relates to the fiduciary responsibilities of pension plan management.

These criticisms and proposals regarding private pension plans raise a number of important and fundamental issues involved in public policy in this area. The most basic issue raised involves the relationship between government and the private sector in providing for the retirement of our aged. I will review what I said before because I feel that this issue is most important. It is essential that we develop the private pension plan as the primary source of retirement for the aged beyond the floor provided by our present social security system. This course insures the individual the freedom to choose the type of retirement provisions he desires and a means to provide for them, it provides for a program which is more flexible and adjustable for individuals and groups with varying needs and circumstances, and finally, it provides the most efficient and economically desirable process for providing for the retirement of our senior citizens. I would actually like to see our emphasis of private retirement programs carried one step further by providing that each individual be given the option of choosing between participation in the social security system or establishing his own program which as a minimum must provide at least the benefits he would receive under social security—just as is presently provided for the Federal civil service employees. I have introduced legislation which would accomplish just such a thing—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 7, 1967, pages 5729–5731.

The proposals to regulate the specific terms of the pension arrangement raise some delicate issues relating to the optimum steps which may be taken to promote the advancement and effectiveness of private pension programs. On the one hand, these programs should both protect the rights of the individual participants by providing for vesting and portability on a reasonable basis and provide for ample safeguards against the loss of vested benefits. In protecting the participants' rights, consideration should be given to preservation of the mobility of our labor force and to the free utilization of the financial assets of the funds for their own benefit and that of the general economy. On the other hand, the employer and employee, either individually or through his union organization, should be free to negotiate, to a large extent, pension arrangements the same as other terms of employment such as salary, vacation, insurance, hospital and medical benefits, and working conditions are negotiated. The employer should be free to utilize his pension arrangement to attract and hold employees. Both employer and employee should have the flexibility to design pension arrangements according to their particular situation and circumstances, such as the other employment benefits provided, the nature of the work, the status and the size of the employer and the industry and so on. These two basic considerations on both hands should be carefully balanced against each other in formulating any regulations to control private pension programs. Both sides of the picture should be carefully reviewed so that these plans may continue to develop and improve. Care should be taken to see that regulations and controls do not discourage the establishment of new programs covering additional workers. Excessive requirements as to funding and vesting and reinsurance may only make it difficult for new plans to start with reasonable contribution rates and with provision for adequate retirement benefits, and difficult for existing plans to expand their benefits and coverage.

Funding and vesting are different animals in mushrooming new industries and in declining old industries and in stable long-term growth industries. Equity and fairness do not require that an employee get back everything that he or his employer contribute when he terminates his employment after several years, but merely that he get what he bargained for under informed, noncoercive, and fair bargaining procedures. Not all employers can afford early vesting.

Finally, before any regulations are imposed upon private pension programs, the need for regulation should be clearly established and the extent of the regulation should be commensurate with the need. Regulations which are directed at remedying abuses by a minority should not hamstring or work hardship on those who already do or would comply with the standards set.

The plans of many employers already conform to many, if not all, of the standards suggested for private pension programs. For example, every study of pension fund management to date, including the 1961 report to the Commission on Money and Credit and the 1965 President's Committee report indicate that such funds have been well managed and that most abuses that have been reported in employee benefit funds have been in the area of health and welfare funds that were nonqualified under the Internal Revenue Code and handled by

individual trustees. The great majority of qualified private pension funds are administered by banks and trust companies as corporate trustee or as agent for individual trustees and these are staffed by experienced personnel schooled in the high traditions of fiduciary responsibility, backed by financial integrity and supervised by several National and State governmental agencies. Another substantial segment of private pension plans are funded through arrangements with life insurance companies and these too are managed by the same type of experienced personnel and are supervised by regulatory authorities. The 1965 report to Congress of the Labor Department under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act indicates that in 1965 only four indictments were brought by the Justice Department under title 18 of the United States Code, dealing with embezzlements, kickbacks, and false reporting. Many standards for the handling of pension funds have already been established under the Internal Revenue Code, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act and Federal and State laws in regard to banking, insurance, and trust law. These existing controls and checks and the relatively low level of abuse in the financial management of private pension plans should dictate the type and scope of any regulation imposed. The establishments, where the need exists, of the minimum standards at levels which are reasonable in relation to varied circumstances and situations throughout all our industries and which provide for ample flexibility for the negotiation of pension arrangements is a desirable goal. However, it is my hope that in any study conducted by the Congress on private pension plan legislation be one of objective inquiry and not subjective questioning designed to serve a preconceived and uninformed opinion.

In spite of the work of the President's Commission on Corporate Pension Funds and the additional studies of the Labor Department and the studies performed by the Congress, such as the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee in 1966, there needs to be considerably more data obtained and a much more developed dialog on this subject before the Congress can determine the best course of action to follow. We in the Congress have not heard, for instance, in any precise terms and from those who are best informed, such as the trust and insurance companies administering private pension programs, what the impact of minimum standards on vesting and funding would be on currently unfunded plans with relatively long vesting requirements. What would be the costs and benefits of such plans if certain minimum standards were established? How could presently existing and potential plans exist or develop under such controls? What type of portability formulas for transferring retirement credits could be developed and how could they best be administered? All of these questions and many more must be answered before we can intelligently carry the dialog forward to fruition.

The bills introduced by Senator JAVITS and others may hopefully lead to a thoughtful development of the facts and issues and a resolution of the problems in this area. The future of the private pension plan as a moving force in our economy and as an efficient mechanism for providing for retirement is at stake.

In considering legislation which would regulate private pension programs, thought must be given to coordinating the scheme designed for these programs not only with social security but also with legislation in other related areas such as unemployment compensation laws, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the proposed Human Investment Act, particularly with respect to providing for those workers over 45 or 50 who lose their jobs before they are eligible for retirement, the pension programs for the self-employed, and our tax laws relating both to private pension plans and the tax structure for the aged. The interrelationships among these areas is discussed to some extent in my dissenting minority views at page 79 in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 15119, the Unemployment Insurance Amendments of 1966.

One of the significant areas which is not adequately provided for under legislation to date relates to the problems of the preretirement worker over age 45 to 50. Technological advances, including automation, and other factors leave many of our preretirement workers over this age with obsolete skills. In many cases these people cannot be retrained for comparable jobs in other skills. In other cases, comparable jobs or jobs which they can handle physically are unavailable. Where these workers are capable of being retrained in usable skills and where their retraining is economically practical, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the proposed Human Investment Act, and other programs are designed to provide much of the need in this area. However, there is no satisfactory provision made to assist the workers who cannot be retrained or otherwise employed. Unemployment compensation, as it should be, is limited to providing temporary relief for the worker who can find further employment. For the worker who cannot find a job this compensation only briefly delays his problem.

Welfare is not an appropriate answer for the worker who may have savings, investments, and other assets which would disqualify him under a needs test until they have been eaten away. In effect, the worker in this category is no longer employable in comparable work and has been forced into early retirement. In most cases, these workers have credits under social security and in many cases under private pension programs and in varying extents savings and investments in some cases. However, these credits are not usable until a later age and savings in most cases will not stretch over the remainder of the worker's life or even until he is eligible for a pension.

The most appropriate remedy for the worker in this situation lies in provisions for early retirement. This worker has lost his wages because of age or because of a disability by virtue of age and is threatened with indigency. This is the very case that our old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program was intended to cover. This is the appropriate case for the early utilization of credits under pension programs. The bulk of the workers in this category will have substantial credits under social security. Legislation both in the social security and pension areas which reflects the needs in this area merits careful consideration in the Congress along with any study of retirement legislation.

A second problem confronting the older preretirement worker is the difficulty he experiences in finding employers who are willing to utilize his skills during the relatively short worklife that he has remaining. Presently, pension plans qualifying for special tax treatment, may not defer the coverage of new employees for more than 5 years. New employees, who are near retirement therefore must be covered by qualified pension plans within 5 years even where they may be entitled to substantial pensions in connection with previous employment. The cost to the employer in providing coverage for these people may discourage hiring or reduce the employees preretirement compensation in wages below that which he requires. In these situations, where the new employee is already entitled to pensions under previous employment, employers should be able to negotiate pension coverage freely so long as the employee's pension credits are above a certain level. Portability of pension credits would provide one solution to this situation. The problem needs further study, however.

The problems relating to late retirement should be considered at the same time we look at early retirement. In this connection it is important that we consider the process by which the wage earner emerges into retirement status. Just as the newcomer does not always enter the work force abruptly or at any particular age the retiring worker does not always assume retirement status abruptly or at a specific age, such as 62 or 65. Many persons are ready for retirement or desire retirement at a relatively early age. Others are capable of and desirous of working into their later years. In many cases the transition from working to retired status is appropriately performed by a gradual process where the worker moves from full employment to part-time employment to full retirement over a number of years. Age 65 or age 62 are not magic numbers which automatically signal retirement. They are average retirement ages which provide a benchmark for actuarial computations and for establishing retirement program policies.

Our social security system is not readily or properly adaptable to provide the flexibility necessary for providing for gradual retirement at varying ages. The system is designed to insure, albeit social insurance, the wage earner against the loss of wages due to full retirement or disability. As such, the earnings limitation in the system cannot be eliminated so as to provide equitably for late and gradual retirement. Similarly, the law, in its present form as a partially social program, cannot, at reasonable costs, equitably provide for

adequate, early retirement. On the other hand, private pension plans are adaptable for these purposes. Most private plans presently permit earnings after retirement. Many of them provide for much earlier retirement than the social security system. It is essential that this type of flexibility be preserved in the retirement system we design.

These are just a few of the problems involved in Federal retirement policies which need review in Congress.

I have discussed this subject in a number of previous speeches including a talk on "Pensions and Employee Benefits" before the American Pension Conference in New York, in 1962, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 1, page 304. In most instances that I have discussed social security, I have discussed it in relation to the whole pension picture. The current hearings in the Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 5710 contain numerous references which I made to the role of social security in our retirement programs. In introducing H.R. 6697, which provides for a voluntary retirement system in lieu of social security, I included a previous talk entitled "Politics Can Destroy Social Security." This appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 1967, pages 5729–5730.

It is my hope that an expanding and in depth dialog will progress on the role that private pension plans, social security, and all of our retirement programs should play in a comprehensive retirement program for the elderly.

THE NO-WIN WAR

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, reporting on U.S. losses of aircraft in Vietnam to date, an Associated Press release of April 22 stated:

> The United States has lost 1,300 planes and 808 helicopters through combat and accidents in the Vietnam war, U.S. military headquarters reported Saturday.

Of the 1,300 planes lost, 500 were lost in combat over North Vietnam and 107 were shot down in South Vietnam. The remaining 621 planes were lost in both North and South Vietnam to nonhostile causes such as accidents and operational mishaps.

Of the 808 helicopters destroyed, 334 were shot down by enemy fire, five in North Vietnam and the remaining 329 in the south, with 474 helicopters lost to accidental crashes or destroyed on the ground by mortar and guerrilla attacks.

It is depressing enough to view these figures in the light of our present "building bridges" policy with the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations who supply the North Vietnamese with the vital supplies of war. But we here at home cannot possibly sense the reaction of those who put their lives on the line in Vietnam.

The cold tabulation of aircraft losses referred to above can never approach the sense of loss of even one of its pilots. How one such pilot, whose aircraft is no doubt listed in the figures above, felt about the Vietnam war, was graphically reported by Carolyn Barta, in the Dallas Morning News of April 15. Capt. Brooke M. Shadburne, a U.S. Marine Corps helicopter pilot, who was killed on April 5 during an evacuation of wounded, was concerned about dying in vain in a no-win war. For those who agree with his views, these words from a State Department pamphlet of 1961 entitled, "How Foreign Policy Is Made," are pertinent:

> We are a government "of the people, by the people, for the people." This means that all decisions ultimately must pass the test of public acceptance. This also means that periodically the people avail themselves of their right to change the men through whom they govern themselves.
>
> This is an important fact in our foreign relations. It puts the world on notice that America is capable of continually revitalizing its leadership with fresh, new, and vigorous men, armed with a clear mandate from the people.

I include the article, "Pilot Worried About Dying in Vain in No-Win War," in the RECORD at this point:

PILOT WORRIED ABOUT DYING IN VAIN IN NO-WIN WAR

(By Carolyn Barta)

Gordon Shadburne looked Tuesday at the University of Plano building that will be named in honor of his brother, and at a letter written before the brother was killed in Vietnam.

"Thanks in advance for writing a story about my brother," he said. "If the public becomes aware that we must make a policy of going into Vietnam to win, then his life will have meant something, and his death will not have been in vain."

Capt. Brooke M. Shadburne, U.S. Marine Corps helicopter pilot who was killed in Vietnam April 5 during an evacuation of wounded, was concerned about dying in vain for a "no win" war.

In a letter to Gordon and his mother, Mrs. Helen Shadburne of Plano, postmarked March 19, Capt. Shadburne wrote of his frustration at having to fight a "no win" war, his concern for his young family in Houston and his ideas on how to win the war.

He wrote of the party-going general, and in contrast the tragedy of pathos of the victims of the Vietnam nightmare.

"For close to a month now, I have been flying the commanding general of the entire Marine forces, both ground and air, in Vietnam, I have ferried every dinner guest, carried or observed everyone that dropped in for an interview.

"I have carried him to all his social functions and to all the visits he has made to operating units. And to this date, I haven't seen any effort being put into the war.

"What war?" Capt. Shadburne asked.

"It's a little hard to believe until one goes into the hospital to help hand out the Purple Hearts every week and you see the legless, armless, eyeless cripples. I saw one guy who will have to have his neck in traction, flat on his back the rest of his life.

"Big handsome guy, he could move his eyes and talk—and that is all. The rest of his life.

"What life?"

Capt. Shadburne wrote about soldiers who are "waiting to get hit by new Russian weapons while the general attends the New Year's sports festival, traveling the half mile of good road by helo (helicopter), not car—a helo that could have guns and rockets on it and be supporting the ground forces."

The 27-year-old pilot explained in his letter that he is "not one to jump to conclusions." But, after a summer and a winter in Vietnam and 600 combat missions, Capt. Shadburne offered a few recommendations for ending the war which seems, instead, he said, to have become a game:

"Cut off all of North Vietnam's sources of supply by sea, air and land.

"Bring them to their knees to stop the inflow of men and arms to South Vietnam.

"Make a huge, ruthless, mighty sweep through South Vietnam to clean out the remaining diehard, and by then underfed and under-supplied VC guerrillas.

"Then and only then, rearm, train and supervise the Arvin (Army of the Republic of Vietnam). Teach the children, aid the homeless, help in agrarian reform. Only then will it do any good."

"The moves outlined sound harsh," Capt. Shadburne wrote, "but so is being shot through the chest with a Chi Com AK47 in South Vietnam.

"And the irony of it all," he added "is that if we took a truly firm stand we would be respected as a nation."

Capt. Shadburne wrote of the "fun new rules of the game" which say that helicopter pilots and mechanics get to return to Vietnam after six months duty in the States.

He said he couldn't see "coming back after six months stateside to this kind of war. I plan to turn in my regular commission resignation next month and hope they will buy it.

"As it stands now, the world is my oyster. All I've got to do now is return long enough to open it."

Capt. Shadburne's oyster won't be opened. But the University of Plano hopes that it will honor his death by helping other young men and women to open their own worlds.

The university will grant a scholarship each semester to a political science major, and will offer scholarships to Capt. Shadburn's three youngsters, who are not yet of school age.

Friday, at 3:30 p.m., the University of Plano will dedicate its liberal arts building to Capt. Shadburne, naming it "Brooke Shadburne Hall."

THE ADMINISTRATION'S "FEAR GAP"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the administration has been spreading misinformation in an attempt to block passage of the Republican-sponsored plan to allocate Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, incorporated in my measure, H.R. 8983, to amend the administration's measure, H.R. 7819, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—ESEA—through the 1968–69 school year.

The credibility gap of the administration is only too well known. Now the administration has resorted to a "fear gap" to try to avert its first major defeat in the 90th Congress. The misinformation the administration has circulated about the effect my measure would have on pupils in private schools has produced the fear. Mr. Speaker, the administration has deliberately misinterpreted the Republican-sponsored measure because the administration fears a defeat on this legislation would be a major blow and set a pattern which

would be followed through Congress this year in other legislation.

The Republican plan, laid out in detail in the April 20, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, has attracted widespread support. It would return Federal funds to States through block grants rather than categorical grants. This would result in more efficient use of Federal aid to elementary and secondary school pupils.

Mr. Speaker, my plan would not take benefits away from private school pupils, as the administration has caused to be circulated in widespread rumors. The Republican plan continues all the benefits of the present law for private school students.

Children in private schools must be included in the program. No State plan could be approved unless it met requirements designed to safeguard private school children, because the funds must be used for the benefit of students both in public and private schools to the extent consistent with the number of children attending each. This is exactly the same as provided in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

My proposal includes another safeguard, the so-called bypass mechanism. If a State could not legally provide for the loan of textbooks, instructional equipment and materials for private school pupils and teachers, the U.S. Commissioner of Education would arrange for such loans on an equitable basis from the funds allotted to the States. This is exactly the arrangement which works successfully in the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It is also claimed that the funds under the Republican block grant amendment would no longer be utilized for educationally deprived children to the extent that it has heretofore. This also is not true, since at least 50 percent of the funds going to States must be used for special programs for educationally deprived children. This would mean $300 million more for educationally deprived children than is presently the case.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the administration has chosen to try to manipulate private school administrators by planting the seeds of fear that children in those schools would lose Federal benefits if the Republican-sponsored measure became law.

This latest maneuver is typical of the cynical disregard for fact which has come to characterize the operations of the administration. The administration is trying the same power play in order to defeat the Republican plan to save the faltering war on poverty. The administration has been planting false rumors the Republicans only want to kill the war on poverty, which is 180 degrees removed from the truth. The Republicans want to make the war on poverty truly effective.

Mr. Speaker, a recent story uncovered the fact the present administration is spending at least $425 million a year for public relations. With nearly a half a billion dollars at their disposal, it is easy to understand how the administration can mount huge campaigns whenever any of its programs are threatened, as in the case of the amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We who present constructive alternatives to administration proposals, whether in aid to education or the war to end poverty, can only continue to present the truth. The truth is, relative to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that the Republican plan is sound and will bring more benefits to pupils in both private and public schools.

TEACHER CORPS ENDORSEMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, continued education has become an essential but highly burdensome expense for many teachers today in order to keep their present job or to meet the ever more stringent requirements for advancement. Certainly the cost of these additional courses represent for the teaching profession a justifiable and necessary business expense and as such should be accorded its proper place as a tax exemption. Our teachers are unfortunately underpaid as it is and so I urge my colleagues to support a bill I introduced today to make our tax structure more equitable by letting them deduct such expense including certain travel, from their gross income for tax purposes.

FEDERAL SUPPORT TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, recently some splendid remarks on Federal support to higher education were delivered to the Mason-Dixon district annual conference of the American College Public Relations Association, by Mr. Leo S. Tonkin, president of Leo S. Tonkin Associates, Inc., a respected Washington educational consulting organization.

The remarks of Mr. Tonkin were notable for their clarity and constructive suggestions in dealing with the complex area of involvement of higher education institutions in federally supported programs of community service and international activity.

I commend the reading of this speech by all those interested in the role of higher education in America.

The speech referred to is as follows:

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: SOME CONSIDERATIONS AND CAVEATS

I was delighted when my good friend, Jim Butler of The Johns Hopkins University, invited me to speak to you today. For one thing, I welcome the opportunity—however short-lived—to leave a sometime frenzied Washington and revisit this historic and splendid community of Williamsburg. For another, there was given to me an opportunity to discuss with you some of the new directions in the Federal Government's support of higher education, and to raise some considerations and caveats about your possible involvement with federal programs.

All of you have concerned yourselves at one time or another with the relationship of your institution to the Federal Government, and with the difficult questions of federal involvement with higher education generally. Few of you need to be reminded that the federal commitment is enormous and varied—or that it steadily grows larger and more complex. As the United States Office of Education is now celebrating its centennial, we might refresh our memory about the magnitude of the Government's effort.

The Office of Education tells us that today it administers a $4 billion budget, involving over 75 educational programs. We've come a long way from the post Civil War days of the first Commissioner, Harry Barnard, whose first budget was less than $19,000! Of this $4 billion, probably 40%, or $1.6 billion, is directly devoted to institutions or students of higher education. I will merely mention some of the recent authority for this financial assistance.

One very important source of construction funds for institutions is the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. In Fiscal Year 1967, ending June 30, 1967, Congress provided more than $722 million to carry out the purposes of the Act. Over one-half billion was earmarked for outright grants to aid the construction of undergraduate and graduate academic facilities; $200 million was made available for construction loans.

Federal support for educational research activities is of growing importance to higher education institutions. Is your school interested in curriculum research or in the training of educational researchers? If so, you probably know of the millions of dollars allocated to such research and training under the amended Cooperative Research Act. Are your school's interests directed toward library research, education media research, or research on education of the deaf? There are laws authorizing federal support for each of these.

In addition, there is nearly $30 million currently available to support research and development centers which will tackle major problems of education. It was perhaps inevitable that the Office of Education should recently borrow a page from the Department of Defense and call for proposals to establish educational *policy* research centers. There are now "think tanks" in education's future!

Financial assistance for students derives from two major pieces of legislation—both of them administered by the Office of Education—the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the National Defense Education Act. Under the former, $112 million was appropriated for educational opportunity grants to enable promising high-school graduates of exceptional financial need to attend college. $134 million was made available for payments to college students from low income families who are working part-time for the college. And $43 million was provided to pay the costs of interest and insurance on student loans provided through commercial lenders.

The National Defense Education Act appropriation for fiscal 1967 includes $190 million for student loan funds, and $2 million for loans to educational institutions unable to meet the matching requirements of the student loan program. Thousands of students in this nation are the grateful and better-trained beneficiaries of this form of aid.

I might note, in regard to Federal support of students in higher education, that the Office of Education is not the only supplier of student support. In 1964, I compiled a report for the House of Representatives Select Committee on Government Research entitled

"Federal Student Assistance in Higher Education." In that study, using 1962–63 data, we found that over 300 Federal student support programs existed and these programs were administered by some 30 separate federal agencies. While the largest area of support programs, as expected, derived from NDEA student loans, the next largest area of funding stemmed from Government research and development grants to colleges and universities. When a faculty investigator is chosen to perform a research project, he very often picks a number of student assistants, and this form of support was surpassed only by National Defense student loans. It would be interesting to see what this situation is today in 1967.

So much for just a few of the outstanding public laws aiding higher education.

NEW DIRECTIONS

I turn to the question, "What is new about the Federal involvement?" What, we may ask, are the underlying concerns of Congress as it continues to elaborate upon an already complex and sometimes confusing pattern of public laws?

Historically, one may depict a pattern of *selective* Congressional response to the educational needs of a nation challenged to fulfill its potential at home and to maintain a position of pre-eminence in the community of nations. One is tempted to view in this fashion the enactment of the multitude of public laws aiding higher education since 1960. But this view of things would overlook an important new direction in the philosophy and exercise of governmental authority.

I suggest to you that in recent years, the U.S. Congress has shown a strong inclination to deal with the *totality* of problems affecting this nation at home and abroad. It is no longer content to leave things as they have been or are likely to be without governmental action. Let me discuss this more inclusive, activist orientation of Congress—first, in the domestic context of our urbanized society, and second, in the context of responses to the world at large.

In the communities of this nation, the presence—to cite but a few contributing factors—of pollution, unemployment, poverty, crime, discrimination, inadequate transportation, substandard or overcrowded housing, and the lack of adequate educational and cultural resources, has led to crises and disaster. You need no examples from this speaker to remind you. The youth in our cities seem often to have been made the unwitting victims of a hostile society before, during, and after their formal educational experience. Too often, the result is a destroyed or severely debilitated capacity for productive, creative adult life, and either a denial of or substantially diminished opportunity for participation in the rewards of citizenship.

Faced with this panoply of problems, Congress has developed an intense concern with the well-being of our *society*, and communities. This concern translates itself into an array of laws which focus upon social ills in the common effort to root out and eradicate them. Virtually all these laws look to *creativity* and *innovation* in diagnosing and remedying social ills. Nearly all of them rely upon the anticipated results of research in the problem areas.

And so we come back to the institutions of higher education in America, upon whose abilities to innovate and create in response to the public need, the success or failure of these new laws depend. Let me illustrate.

By enacting a national program of supports and incentives for the several States under the State Technical Services Act of 1965, Congress evidenced its concern that advances in science and technology be made available to American business, commerce, and industry. It was left to the States, in cooperation with universities, communities, and industries, to aid in the diffusion and use of such advances by providing pertinent technical services for both new and established business, commerce, and industrial establishments.

All accredited institutions of higher education in a participating State are invited to submit proposals for providing technical services under the Act, including the sponsoring of industrial workshops, seminars, training programs, extension courses, demonstrations, and field visits designed to encourage the more effective application of scientific and engineering information.

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is designed to assist in the solution of "community problems" through the involvement of community service programs of colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are looked to for performance of educational services, the conduct of educational research programs, and the programs of continuing and extension education for adults.

Title IIA of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizes the Community Action Program. The avowed purpose is to help communities mobilize their resources for a coordinated attack on poverty and its interrelated causes and symptoms. Institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for a grant for the development, conduct, and administration of a community action program. Perhaps more important, under the Act, they are eligible for grants to *train* the specialized *personnel* who will be implementing such action programs; and, they are eligible for grants or contracts for *research* and *demonstrations* relating to poverty and avoidance of it.

In another field of endeavor with special meaning to our communities, one finds the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, which provides grants for projects that will demonstrate techniques and methods which, it is hoped, will make a real contribution to the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. Colleges and universities are among those eligible for assistance. Further, the same law provides for grants to train personnel who are working with delinquent youth; university-based training centers; curriculum development, and workshops, institutes and seminars are among the supported activities. The educational orientation is obvious. I might add that this law expires with the close of the current fiscal year. Proposed legislation will provide for continuation and expansion of these demonstration and training grant programs, as well as grants for facilities and other aids.

A related effort is underway because of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965. Any university interested in establishing a degree program in police science may apply for a grant that will enable it to achieve this result. The recent report of the President's Crime Commission will very likely stimulate additional and broader supports for higher education institutions in the battle against crime.

Government support for the humanities was focused in 1965 with the enactment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act. Previously, the Office of Education had administered programs of support, under laws, such as the Cooperative Research Act, the National Defense Education Act, and the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1963. Additional help was furnished scholars through the facilities, services, and incomparable resources of the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution.

Now, for the first time, however, there is express recognition by Congress, to quote from the Act, that "the encouragement and support of national progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiatives, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government." In addition to enlarging the responsibilities of the Office of Education with respect to education in the arts and humanities, a new agency, the National Endowment for the Humanities, was authorized to award fellowships and grants to institutions or individuals for training and workshops in the humanities, and to foster by grants or other means, public understanding and appreciation of the humanities.

In response to the legislative mandate, the Endowment has defined three initial objectives. To borrow from its First Annual Report:

"The third objective . . . is the improvement of the teaching of the humanities in schools, colleges, and universities and also among the public at large in order to infuse our present activities with the wisdom that is the product of the humanistic outlook. This is probably the most important of the objectives. . . , since it brings the humanities to bear on important questions; but it is also the most difficult to accomplish. It is necessary that inspiring teaching in schools and colleges excite the initial interest of citizens in the whole subject of man and his activities and their best expression."

Once more the relationship of the university to the public interest is at the very heart of the new commitment to a better society.

I suspect enough has been said of the role institutions of higher education are being asked to play in the carrying out of national purpose, as exhibited toward our communities. Congress says, in effect, that considerations of national interest compel the declaration and definition of broad policy objectives which will make for better communities, as well as the financial support of such objectives. But the new ideas, the new applications of knowledge, the actual assistance to the community, and in a word, the success of such efforts, hinge upon the capabilities of our nation's colleges and universities. Upon their willingness to respond to the urgent problems of a free society hinges the ultimate realization or defeat of the American experiment in democracy.

It is but a small step to the articulation of such objectives in America to the realization that this nation and its institutions of education have a mission of similar importance and urgency beyond the confines of the national borders. Indeed, the American scholar has been invited from that proverbial "ivory tower", into the "workshop" of America and the "vineyards" of the world. As Marshall McLuhan says: "The university is fast becoming not an isolated bastion but an integral part of the community. Eventually, nearly every member of a community may be drawn into its affairs." Or as Thorstein Veblen has noted:

"The university is ideally and in popular apprehension a corporation for the cultivation of the community's highest ideals and aspirations."

The point to remember is that in the breadth of the American vision, the scholar's community is no longer circumscribed by his academic walls but now extends into our society and the community of mankind.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

In our international society, education is of dominant importance. Since the end of World War II, federal assistance to students, scholars, and schools has accelerated the training of specialists in foreign languages, area studies, and the problems of emerging nations. The State Department, USIA, and AID have played key roles in making this assistance so effective. In 1965 alone, it is estimated that nearly 4,000 faculty members were assisted while studying or engaged in research abroad, or applying their skills to the problems of emerging nations. About

18,000 students studied abroad at foreign institutions of higher education. Nearly 100,000 foreign students and scholars were either studying or teaching at our own schools.

The International Education Act of 1966 splendidly builds on these earlier programs of assistance. It gives a new thrust to programs of assistance at the undergraduate and graduate levels. It provides new central direction for the government's commitment to the cause of international education. I want to read to you the introductory words employed by Congress in the International Education Act, because I believe you will find them both meaningful and hopeful. Here they are:

"The Congress hereby finds and declares that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between Nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this generation and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research, to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel in academic and professional fields, and to coordinate the existing and future programs of the Federal Government in international education, to meet the requirements of world leadership."

How does the Act operate to translate the declaration of purpose into tangible results? The answer is found in Titles I and II of the Act. Title I authorizes new institutional supports for international education in our colleges and universities. At the undergraduate level, a program of grants is authorized to help institutions plan, develop, and implement broad programs to strengthen and improve instruction in international studies. Suggested elements of these programs include teaching, research, and curriculum development; expansion of foreign language courses; overseas training of faculty; student work-study-travel under university supervision and planning; and visiting faculty and scholars.

At the graduate level, support is authorized for the establishment, strengthening, and operation of Centers of Advanced International Study. These centers will stress research and training in international aspects of professional and other fields of study. Any institution of higher education is eligible for such grants, but the apparent intent of Congress is to place public money with those universities which already have made an investment in programs for which support is asked.

Title II consists of amendments to three other education laws—NDEA, HEA, and the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. In each instance, the law has been altered to broaden support of existing education programs by the addition of international dimension.

The authorized financial support for the Act includes $1 million for FY 1967, $40 million for FY 1968, and $90 million for FY 1969. I must regretfully add, however, that, so far, no funds have been appropriated pursuant to these authorizations.

The administration has sought to remedy this situation by requesting a supplemental appropriation of $350,000 to implement the Act this fiscal year. In addition, the President has requested in FY 1968 a $36.5 million appropriation for the International Education Act which includes $5.9 million in grants for undergraduate studies, and $13 million for graduate studies under Title I.

This is a very commendable response to the realities of the world we live in and the role of the United States in that world. The involvement of this country in international affairs has never been greater, or more significant, than today. More and more over the past twenty years, the information and advice of authorities in such fields as economics, food production, industrial planning and development, education and health, are essential to our nation's foreign policy, not to mention the growth of stable democracies in the underdeveloped regions of the world.

It is clear that more must be done to strengthen the capacity of our higher education institutions to provide the types of support deemed essential by the Federal Government. That is why the principles of support enunciated in the International Education Act are so commendable. Now that the legal basis for support is embedded in public law, let us hope that appropriations will follow without delay.

I suggest *now* is the time to "Get involved!" in the cause of international education. If, as President Johnson has said, "The spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free", then those of you entrusted with this task must work creatively to assure that the new ground plowed by the International Education Act bears fruit. I speak for no interest when I suggest that you exercise your right to be heard before the Congress to secure the much-needed appropriation for this Act.

The very distinguished Chairman of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Education, Wayne Morse, clearly asks for your ideas and support in a recent statement to the American Association of Junior Colleges:

"Many of us believe and have acted on our belief that Washington, D.C., has no monopoly upon wisdom in the field of education legislation. Many of us feel quite strongly that initiatives for programs should arise from and be modified by the educational community of this nation."

Now is the time you should be creatively involved in planning now the future of international education studies at your campus. While the orientation of the Act is toward the international community, its impact is clearly domestic. Thus, the task of planning is yours, and the results of this planning will be in daily evidence on your campus. Indeed, the spirit of international learning and the advancement of knowledge are the only sensible and effective ways to achieve the peace and stability that we all so desperately seek in our troubled world.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND COORDINATION

For a moment, let us turn to some considerations about your institution's involvement with Federal programs. In my experience as a planning consultant and a federal relations adviser to educational institutions, I have found that *long-range planning* and *program coordination* are essential to the schools' well-being.

One of the finest things the Federal aid programs have done is spark in-depth and long-term thinking about the institution—its needs, and its goals. There is a need for much more of this kind of thought. For if you seek involvement with Federal programs, and hope to obtain public funds, and more importantly, if you wish to preserve an independent frame of reference for the values and traditions of the institution, you must be able to define the proper relationship of the federal program to the overall objectives of the school.

Such planning, of necessity, directs you to the best use of federal funds, as well as to the sorting out and weighing of alternative futures for the institution. Once you have set your objectives and articulated your needs, then you may proceed to match them as well as possible to appropriate funding programs. In this way, your academic mission is protected; the philosophy and values of the institution remain your own.

On the need for long-range planning, therefore, my advice to you would be to emulate the wisdom of the great French Marshal, Lautaugny, who once said to his gardener: "I want you to plant that tree tomorrow." And the gardener said, "It won't bear fruit for a hundred years." "In that case," said Lautaugny, "plant it this afternoon." That is how I feel about your long-range planning—start it *today*!

The other aspect of your involvement which merits close attention is coordination of effort. When you get to the point of considering a particular Federal program, take care to learn if other university activities may be germane, and whether other departments and personnel could usefully be involved. Checking and consulting with others in advance is much more effective than trying to smooth ruffled feathers at a later date! This kind of coordination is, or probably should be, the express responsibility of an academic planning officer at your institution.

Another area for coordination is with the community and geographic area served by the institution. Much of the community-oriented legislation requires cooperation with local and regional groups having similar interests; in any event, it makes good sense to pursue a policy of cooperation with such groups.

Finally, by your awareness of the community thrust of much federal aid legislation, you will tend to consider designing federally-supported projects with an eye to extending the benefits to the largest number of citizens of the community. For example, the National Endowment for the Humanities provides grants for research in the humanities. With some careful thinking about the objective of the Endowment such as that of imbuing the public at large with humanistic values, you should be able to envision the involvement of, say, the young children in the community who may otherwise never have exposure to cultural opportunities. This is coordination of effort in the public interest as well as your own.

To summarize, let me merely state for you five points of inquiry which are raised by my office concerning every proposal for federal funding of interest to our client institutions:

First, does this proposal serve an academic need?

Second, does this proposal meet any community need?

Third, is this proposal effectively related to other school activities?

Fourth, what funds may be available for the proposed project and what are the strings attached?

Fifth, have alternative projects been considered and priorities consciously set?

CAVEATS

This is the perfect place to raise some strong *caveats* about the entire government—higher education aid picture. Just as overextended supply lines are the plague of any field army, so an overextension of academic involvements can disrupt the educational goals of your school. It *is* possible to overcommit your strengths and talents to the needs of the community or the Federal Government and thereby dissipate or dilute the effectiveness of those resources required for the primary mission of your institution.

Perhaps David Henry, President of the University of Illinois, best sums up the feeling here by saying:

"Many institutional representatives are concerned that although colleges and universities have not been sufficiently and directly enough assisted in their main job of teaching, research and public service, new projects (which will draw heavily upon the resources of higher education for implementation) have had a higher priority than these perennial activities."

It would be unfortunate, indeed, should the students and scholars of your school be the victims, rather than the beneficiaries, of community involvements.

I have carefully avoided till now any suggestion that higher education is a partner with the Federal Government in the pursuit of programs to benefit the nation. Personally, I think the term is rather overworked and abused. There are many cases of no genuine partnership at all.

Too often, a Federal program prompts a school to follow a new direction which it had never planned or hoped to follow until the advent of the program.

Too often, a Federal program is keyed to expansion of the student body of the school, with the result that an unwitting recipient of funds must admit more students than in its own judgment was desirable or feasible for the nature and resources of the institution.

Too often, the grantee under a Federal program is required to carry on with a project long after Federal funds are available, with the result of a sudden ballooning of financial burden after several semesters of assistance.

And too often, a Federal program forces the recipient school to commit its own scarce funds in satisfaction of matching requirements, when these dollars could be better employed elsewhere. As Frederick Bolman, Director of Special Programs of the ESSO Education Foundation, has wisely noted, "The most genuine need for Federal investment may lie where the least ability to match exists." Sadly, Federal matching requirements work to the most frequent disadvantage of those of our smaller and developing institutions that need the funds the most.

In short, too often there arises an *incompatible commitment*. The promise of Federal dollars is sometimes a lure for the unsuspecting.

At this point, some might say, if the Federal program is not in the school's best interests, then it shouldn't apply, it shouldn't get involved.

To say this would be a tortured oversimplification of a very real dilemma for many schools.

First, it is virtually impossible for a college or university not to assume some responsibility both for service to the nation's communities and the education of its youth. No school can afford to ignore the new interest of the Government and the pressing needs of our society. Our nation and its communities urgently rely upon higher education for new responses to the problems of America and the world beyond. Douglass Cater, Special Assistant to the President, wisely says: "The university which seeks to reclaim an image from the past or to retreat behind campus walls and 'make its garden grow' will be sadly out of tune with the times."

Second, the problem of federal program participation diminishes as the institution defines its long-range interest. As you project your school's future, you invest the school with an identity that permits a rational response to opportunities for Federal funding. The more you recognize the needs and travails of your community and world, the more surprised I suspect you will be as to how much your institution can contribute to their amelioration and solution, and this will be truly meaningful education to your students.

Third, all of us know that community and public support are essential merely to keep the doors of academia open for business. A school needs money to survive, and state and federal dollars provide a splendid source of that increasingly hard to find capital funding.

The problem then is how to become a stronger educational institution even while one accepts the responsibility of community service and seeks federal support in the process. How does the institution maintain a *true* partnership in league with the Government?

THE SHARED-INTEREST APPROACH

The burden clearly rests on those of you charged with the responsibility for development of the institution. That burden is to implement a shared-interest approach between the Government and the school in whatever program involvement you may choose. Insist to the full extent possible upon a program structure which fosters the educational interests of your school even while it benefits the community.

It is highly likely that the school would plan to do this sort of thing in any case; it is, therefore, asking little of the school to envision similar community involvement when it develops a proposal for federal funds.

Now, admittedly, many of the new programs authorized by law do not allow such a shared-interest approach. And this is wrong. More and more institutions of higher education, almost of necessity, are sacrificing educational quality on the one-way street to community involvements.

The Federal programs would be less onerous to the academic community if they were made more rewarding to the affected institutions. It is up to you to insist on true support for your school and faculty when you accept increased community service. This holds for community service in the international as well as the national sense.

I might note here that a very sensible federal statutory provision in this regard is contained in Sec. 700.15 of the Regulations of the State Technical Services Act. That provision reads:

"Federal financial assistance under the Act or the regulations in this part may be granted to any designated agency or participating institution in support of a technical services program presently funded by State or other non-Federal sources and operating therein when such program is modified or expanded in light of the objectives of the Act."

This indeed encourages a shared-interest approach to educational involvement via Federal dollars. All parties concerned can benefit—the school might receive funding for an on-going, already budgeted program if it ensures that its offering is modified or more closely attuned to the intent of the Act. The Government benefits by getting a needed job accomplished. The community benefits by having expanded interest accorded its problems by the local educational institutions.

Through testimony to Congress, through active participation in policy formulation with the administering agencies, through your own planning and designing of balanced projects, in all these ways, you can strive to read some life and substance into the idea of a mutually productive relationship between the Federal Government and American higher education.

The task is a challenging one. There are signs that it is being done—but nowhere near the level of accomplishment which is now required. Take up the challenge in the months and years to come. Federal funding holds promise of building stronger institutions of education, a better America, and a more stable, peaceful international community. Realization of the promise depends on America's educational leadership to respond with creative and innovative programs that will occasion increased and truly beneficial support from our federal government.

THE TEACHER CORPS IN DANGER

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Washington Post ran an excellent editorial on one of the most inspiring and moving experiments this country has undertaken during these exciting years. I refer to the Teacher Corps, a program by which the same spirit of dedication and selfless public interest that made the Peace Corps a worldwide success can be directed toward this country's needs for teachers, especially in those areas in which there are large concentrations of disadvantaged youngsters.

Six years ago, John F. Kennedy asked the people of America to ask what they could do for their country. People of all ages responded with an enthusiasm and a disregard for personal profit which thrilled us all. Young people in particular, but not young people alone, volunteered in great numbers for the Peace Corps, and brought to the people of the developing nations concrete proof that Americans were interested in helping them. The same willingness of Americans to give of their time and their energies to help their own fellow citizens has been demonstrated in the VISTA program, and in the initial response to the Teacher Corps.

Shortly, the House will be considering the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967—a bill which will, if enacted as reported, continue the Teacher Corps program. We are also on notice that we will be asked to pass judgment on a Republican substitute, advanced by my good friend, the able and distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. One effect of his substitute will be to bring to a halt the Teacher Corps experiment for the foreseeable future.

I think this would be, for the excellent reasons which the Post editorial sets forth, a deeply tragic decision for this House to make. The Teacher Corps needs all the support it can get. I hope our friends on the other side of the aisle will reconsider their plans to wipe out the Teacher Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I referred be printed at the end of these remarks.

TEACHING TEACHERS

Congress ought to give thoughtful consideration to a report just released by the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. The report is an appraisal of the Teachers Corps during its first year of operation; and it is strikingly enthusiastic about the performance and the potentialities of this fledgling group in a period when it was peculiarly handicapped by problems of organization and by inadequate funds. At the same time, the report is something more: it is an insightful discussion of the special problems of teaching "disadvantaged" children.

A major educational challenge confronts the country. Public school systems in every major city are flooded today with the flotsam of a vast new migration—from rural areas to urban centers. Many of these migrants, uneducated, even illiterate and accustomed to agricultural employment, are wholly unequipped for participation in an industrial economy; and often, in consequence, they find themselves crowded into decaying neighborhoods, unemployed, exploited and des-

perate. Their children, often, are in a real sense disinherited—deprived of any cultural stimulation or any incentive to learn.

It is for these children that the schools must today undertake a special task—a task analogous to but different from the task accomplished by the public schools at the turn of the century in making the melting pot a reality for the children of the migrants from Europe. "For centuries," the report of the Advisory Council observes, "schools have dealt almost wholly with students who have valued learning and have come to school in search of it. Among the children with whom the Teacher Corps works, the first task is not so much to *teach* them as to *reach* them, in order to persuade them that they can learn—and that learning can be useful, interesting and rewarding."

The Teachers Corps recruits idealistic and committed young college graduates who want to do this specialized and difficult type of teaching; and it trains them for the task in participating universities and in the public schools of disadvantaged neighborhoods which have asked for their help. During the past school year, some 1200 Corps members have served in 275 schools in 111 school districts in 29 states, serving in each case at the invitation of a local school system. Usually they work in teams of three to ten interns, headed by a team leader who is an experienced teacher. They are subordinates of the local school authorities, conforming to local rules and practices, paid at a rate equal to that received by the least experienced teachers in the local school district.

The Teachers Corps brings with it not only specialized training and some fresh ideas; even more significantly it brings the ardor of dedicated young people. It has made a great beginning; it can, if it gets the chance, render even richer service in the future. But it will be obliged to go out of business entirely by the end of June unless Congress quickly votes to extend its life and to give it the supplemental appropriation it needs to carry on through the summer. No better investment could be made toward the education of the disadvantaged.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION—H.R. 7098

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1967, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7098, to provide a $10 million supplemental authorization for adult basic education for fiscal 1967. At that time, I fully expressed my concern over the need for a supplemental because of the peculiarity in funding of this program. Many States did not have sufficient time to submit fully developed plans in 1965, the first authorization year, and the bulk of the ABE appropriations for that year was carried over to be added to the 1966 allocation. Thus most States had a higher level of expenditures in 1966 than are possible with only the normal funding in 1967, and this unfortunate situation has already caused elimination of important facets of ongoing adult basic education activities.

The dire effects of this reduction of funds available in 1967 is well described in a summary compiled by Mr. James Le Vine, administrator for adult education in the Hawaii Department of Education, and submitted to me by Mrs. E. Leigh Stevens, chairman of the Adult Education Advisory Council in my State. I ask unanimous consent to insert this compilation in the RECORD at this point as an illustration of the importance of a supplemental ABE appropriation for 1967.

STATE OF HAWAII,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 13, 1967.

To: Mrs. E. Leigh Stevens, Chairman, Adult Education Advisory Council

From: James Le Vine, Administrator, Adult Education

Subject: *Reply to Questions in Your February 27 Letter from Rep. Patsy Mink.*

Q–1. *What is the program for $114,819 federal allocation?*

A–1. Enrollments in adult elementary classes were 3,750 in FY 1964; 3,949 in FY 1965 and 10,006 in FY 1966. On the strength of enrollment increases and expected expansion of federal fund availability, 14 federally-funded positions were added to our staff last year. Cost of these positions for fiscal 1967 is $117,981. The federal allocation of $114,819 will almost (not quite) cover the cost of the 14 positions. State funds are presently supporting all other costs of the program including hourly pay of part-time teachers and supervisors, operating expenses of 57 centers on 6 islands and free books for ABE and NYC students. Current program data for first half FY 1967 is shown in attached Exhibit 1.

Q–2. *What is the program the $10 million supplemental would support?*

A–2. Help maintain and reimburse existing program. In November-December 1966, when we learned that $114,819 was to be our PL 89–750 allocation for fiscal 1966–67, we informed our Board of Education that to maintain the then-existing level of ABE program and personnel until June 1967 would require $100,000 more than had been allocated by federal and state sources combined. To avoid a drastic cutback, the Board authorized us to "borrow" the amount from D.O.E. reserve funds with the understanding we effect all possible savings.

Accordingly, we have stopped all expansion, cancelled 6 planned teacher-training workshops, left vacant our ABE Program Specialist position (Phyllis Hole left in November), cancelled placement of 2 ABE teachers at Oahu Prison, increased the mininum size of ABE classes, depleted our reserves of textbooks; curtailed travel, mileage, staff conferences and supervisory visits; postponed opening a new school center (Hauula) and belayed plans for a summer session.

Q–3. *Request for breakdown of A.E. budget.*

A–3. See Exhibit 2, 2A.

Q–4. *Listing of kinds of courses (services) Federal ABE funds made possible.*

A–4. (1) Previously only elementary grades 1–6 were tuition free. Now all elementary classes to grade 8 are free, including free books. New classes include Preparation for 8th grade diploma, Pre-high school remedial reading, speech improvement, arithmetic; ungraded adult elementary classes, sign language, basic parent education (courses tailored to local needs such as child care, consumer education, etc.), experimental classes such as teaching reading through sewing, teaching spelling through typing.

(2) A pilot language lab. facility was installed at McKinley.

(3) An "independent study center," using programmed instruction under teacher supervision is under way in Kailua library. This is an ungraded class with flexible scheduling in which students can enter and exit without reference to traditional semesters or class hours.

(4) With capability of paying a small rental fee where necessary, several churches and other private buildings are being utilized for daytime classes.

(5) Added funds for school supervisory staff have made it possible to operate numerous small branch centers (see Exhibit 1) in housing projects, hospitals and out-of-the-way places on all islands, bringing educational opportunity closer to the people needing it.

(6) A pilot ETV program "Operation Alphabet," five one-half hour programs per week, is under way aimed at teaching the 3 R's to people who can understand and speak English but cannot read and write. Plans and production is also under way, to add another one-half hour per week of locally produced programming.

(7) In coordinating with Operation Alphabet, special classes for newcomer ethnic groups (Samoan) utilize a Samoan teacher or aide to follow up on the ETV lessons.

(8) Special classes have been designed and operated in cooperation with local NYC and other anti-poverty groups to serve a variety of special needs. Additional services of the D.O.E. have included free testing, special instructional materials, classroom equipment for use in a non-school facility, etc.

Q–5. *Number of planned programs curtailed (abandoned) due to reduced FY 67 budget.*

A–5. See A–2. Major items:

Two full time ABE teachers for Oahu Prison.

Local teacher training workshops and plans for U.H. Summer Institute.

New school center, Hauula (full time principal and steno).

Summer session ABE classes.

State ABE Program Specialist (position being left vacant).

State Conference of ABE program administrators.

All school centers told in December to stop recruitment beyond number of classes they had in first half of 1966. Estimate 30–40 classes were thus curtailed.

Family-life program (State Program Specialist and steno. to develop new program).

Q–6. *What programs will have to be dropped if we only receive $114,819 federal money in FY 1967?*

A–6. No existing classes will be dropped in the remainder of FY 67. State deficiency appropriation is underwriting current service needs (less curtailed activities) as explained in A–2 and A–5.

Q–7. *How much additional funds needed in remainder of FY 67 to continue present level of services?*

A–7. Approximately $100,000 would be needed to repay the advance (deficiency appropriation) the State is providing to keep the program intact.

Q–8. *If the supplemental appropriation for ABE is not approved, what services will be curtailed for next four months?*

A–8.

	Est. amount
Reimbursement to State for deficiency approp	$100,000
Teacher training (in-service & U.H.)	3,000
Summer session ABE classes	50,000
State ABE Program Specialist vacancy	3,000
State Conference ABE Program Administrators	600
Reserve supplies ABE books	5,000
Program reviews, supervision, evaluation (6 islands)	700
	162,300

INCREASED INCOME TAX EXEMPTION PROPOSED

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago Congress provided for a personal income tax exemption of $600. In theory, this amount was the minimum needed for a decent standard of living and was not to be taxed.

Maintaining an adequate standard of living on $600 a year in 1947 was, I suspect, extremely difficult. In 1967, it is impossible.

Over the last 20 years, the cost of living has risen 50 percent. The price of bread has nearly doubled. Milk costs 38 percent more than in 1947. The price of apples is up 70 percent.

Today we are fighting a war on poverty based on the supposition that a family of four cannot live on less than $3,000 a year. A family earning less lives in poverty.

But the personal income tax exemption has not been changed. The result is an absurd situation. We say, on the one hand, that a family of four requires a minimum income of $3,000, yet we exempt only $2,400 of that income from Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the $600 exemption is out of touch with reality and it should be changed.

Increasing the personal exemption to $1,200, as I am proposing, would place our income tax structure on a more up-to-date basis. Such action would eliminate the inequities resulting in part from today's unrealistically low exemption.

In dollar terms, a change in the personal exemption would mean substantial savings to families in lower tax brackets. For example, a family of four, earning $8,000 a year and claiming a standard deduction, would save $418 from their tax bill if the individual exemption were doubled.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would increase the individual income tax exemption to $1,200. I hope my bill, or similar legislation, will be considered this year.

SPEAKING OUT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the noisy minority have had its say. Now is the time for the vast, quiet, and responsible majority to be heard.

This is the point of an excellent editorial that appeared recently in the Lawrence, Mass., Eagle-Tribune. I commend this newspaper for its courageous and thoughtful editorial stand.

The fact is that those who protest America's involvement in Vietnam accurately reflect only one aspect of the majority's thinking—namely, the overwhelming desire shared by all Americans to find peace in Vietnam.

But what is the best path to peace?

Is peace achieved by continual sniping at President Johnson?

Is peace achieved by irresponsible charges and by such outrageous acts as burning our flag or marching the Vietcong's banner down Fifth Avenue?

The Eagle-Tribune rightly notes that—

> The dissenters, the harassers of the President, actually are prolonging the war they oppose. Thus, they seem to be defeating their purpose, unless they think they can persuade the President to bow to their will.

The right to protest is basic in a democratic society. But the right to be taken seriously rests upon the merits of the argument.

The American people have soundly rejected extremists on both sides of the Vietnam arguments. Our people reject those who call for a U.S. withdrawal just as strongly as they reject those who want to dangerously escalate this war:

Instead, the people stand with the President and his policy of seeking an honorable solution to the conflict, while defending the security and freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

But the time has come for the responsible citizens in our midst to shed their silence and speak out to defend the policies that make sense and hold the best possibility of leading to peace.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this timely and important editorial from the Eagle-Tribune in the RECORD.

LET THE PRESIDENT KNOW

No American President in wartime, since Abraham Lincoln valiantly coped with a divided nation in the War Between the States, has been so cruelly harassed as President Johnson by bitter foes of his policy among the American people.

Americans traditionally in time of foreign war stand solidly and firmly behind their President and the government he personifies, but not now.

Even in the Congress loud voices are raised against the Vietnam War policy. Such conspicuous senators as the majority leader, Sen. Mansfield, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Sen. Fulbright, and of course that ambitious junior senator from New York, speak out again and again against the Administration's policy.

The noisy reformers eager for all the tax money Washington can collect so they can spend it to reform the domestic scene and all the civil rights advocates and demonstrators attack the President for his war policy. Draft-dodging students join in the hostile chorus and of course the beatniks who are either innate or professional protesters.

Prof. Galbraith, accepting the chairmanship of Americans for Democratic Action, reduced dissent to the lowest level when he based it on danger to the Democratic Party in the President's policies. The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King undertook to raise it to the level of a nation-wide revolution of civil disobedience. Secretary General Thant of the United Nations persistently encourages harassers of the President and promotes throughout the world distrust of and hostility to American purpose by calling for what amounts to American surrender.

Effect of these performances, in the name of noble dissent but contemptuous of the need for unity in a time of crisis, is the portrayal for American enemies in Moscow and Peking and Hanoi and anywhere else they happen to be influential of a great nation divided by a great issue.

Clearest effect of this portrayal of division is to convince the enemy that the United States will quit. Thus the dissenters, the harassers of the President, actually are prolonging the war they oppose. Thus they seem to be defeating their purpose, unless they think they can persuade the President to bow to their will. Galbraith's warning of political danger could have been principally an appeal to the political mind of the President.

Indeed, the persistent harassment of the President makes sense only in terms of the opinion that the President can be harassed into a change of policy of the kind they demand.

There is a fact that they ignore and that the enemy does not see. These harassers of the President constitute a noisy minority. The great majority of the people stand with the President as in foreign wars they have always stood with the man in the White House. They recognize the commitment to South Vietnam, they recognize the danger to the United States of a Communist victory in South-east Asia, they understand the President's military purpose to convince the enemy that he cannot win and that therefore he should consent to negotiations for peace. But they recognize that no peace is tolerable that does not prevent the Communist conquest of South Vietnam and that therefore the enemy must be made to accept such a peace.

In this situation, a great American need is declarations to the President of support from the great but silent rank and file. The President needs encouragement, he needs to know that the people are behind him in his quest for peace with honor. An unceasing flow of letters from the people to the President is in order during this ordeal he is undergoing because of noisy, unpatriotic dissent.

THE HOPALONG CASSIDY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, last week's newspapers quoted the Hopalong Cassidy of the Republican Party, Governor Romney, as saying that there is a "better way than L.B.J. and the people know it."

Very clever. It rhymes. It is short. And it is memorable. We will probably be hearing a lot more of it in the months ahead.

In fact, it may very well take its rightful place someday in the hall of fame of Republican slogans.

Remember that great example of campaign alliteration: "Free Speech, Free Press, Free Soil, Free Men—and Fremont"?

And who can forget "Win With Willkie"?

Or Thomas E. Dewey's perceptive analysis of the public sentiment in 1944: "Time for a Change"? Now there was a slogan. Governor Dewey was back at it again in 1948 with a new slogan: "Biggest House Cleaning in History." Unfortunately—for him—he neglected to say whose house should be cleaned.

And who can forget dear old Dick Nixon's catchy bit of political euphe-

mism: "Experience Counts"? It might have counted, too, if President Eisenhower had been able to think of just one major decision that Mr. Nixon had participated in. He asked for a couple of weeks to come up with one—but to my knowledge he never did.

And, of course, every American over 10 still remembers Barry Goldwater's contribution to the hall of fame: "In your heart you know he's right." That may have been the most honest Republican slogan of them all. He was so far to the right that the public could not see him.

So now we have a new face on the political scene—and a new slogan: "There is a better way than LBJ." I congratulate Governor Romney. To me, that is every bit as good as, "Life, Liberty, and Landon"—and I predict it will be just as effective.

The Republicans have certainly proven that they are the party of slogans. If that is the way they want it, it is fine with me. The Democratic Party is content to be the party of ideas.

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S WAR AGAINST POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people overwhelmingly support the President's war against poverty. They do so knowing that in America in the 1960's there is simply no justification for perpetuating the forces which keep a minority of our people from realizing their hopes and ambitions.

We have learned an important lesson: namely, that it is not enough for most Americans to have the opportunity to go as far as their talents can take them. But we must enlarge this opportunity to give every American a chance.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is working toward these noble ends. I believe that they are doing a credible job in an area where progress is slow and often difficult.

But our people understand that the progress we seek will not happen overnight—there are simply no miracles in the difficult struggle to eliminate conditions of poverty from our land.

Yesterday I received a copy of a resolution adopted by the National Board of the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty. The board is headed by three distinguished Americans—Mr. Walter Reuther, Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch, and Mr. Robert S. Benjamin. I wish to share this resolution with my colleagues in the House and with all the American people. For it says all that must be said about our unwavering commitment to win the war against poverty and to push ahead—against all political obstacles placed in our path—to accomplish our purpose and create a better America for all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this resolution, adopted on April 11, in the RECORD.

CITIZENS' CRUSADE AGAINST POVERTY

(Resolution on the war against poverty adopted at the meeting of the National Board April 11, 1967, Washington, D.C.)

We commend the President for sending to Congress a bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act and strengthen the role of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the over-all War Against Poverty.

However, we are distressed to hear from some quarters attacks on the fundamental purposes and methods of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Some want to dismember this agency, tearing apart its vital parts and programs and indiscriminately transferring them to other agencies. Others would dilute or eliminate the Community Action Program, the most creative and dynamic experiment in the national strategy to overcome poverty.

In the light of these criticisms we would like the nation to recognize that a program of such ambitious goals could not be undertaken without problems. In social experimentation, just as in scientific experimentation, errors of judgment are inevitable. However, criticism, where valid, should not become a pretext for eliminating or destroying the effectiveness of an approach that is fundamentally sound.

We therefore reaffirm the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty's strong support of the War Against Poverty in general and of the Economic Opportunity Act in specific.

We support the principle of a separate and independent Federal agency responsible for coordinating the over-all attack on poverty. To protect its integrity and assure its effectiveness, this agency should be retained within the Executive Office of the President.

We support the strengthening of the Community Action Program as a primary instrument for the re-creation of "communities," and the mobilizing of local public and private groups for planning and administering a comprehensive and coordinated attack on poverty. We urge that funds for the Community Action Program, including its especially commendable programs for agricultural workers and Indians, be greatly increased.

We reaffirm the principle of "maximum feasible participation", urge its incorporation in other programs, and support its implementation through flexible funding of independent grass roots organizations. This principle recognizes for the first time the importance of giving the poor a meaningful voice in planning and administering programs designed to serve their needs and vests within local communities greater responsibility and initiative for local poverty programs.

We commend the Administration for recommitting our nation to the eradication of urban and rural poverty. In the light of the magnitude and urgency of the task, we call on Congress to provide a substantial increase of funds over the request of $2.06 billion.

Firmly believing that the eradication of poverty is essential to the achievement of a democratic society and to the fulfillment of our American heritage, we call upon the nation, both public and private sectors, to expand substantially its commitment of energy and resources to the War Against Poverty.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LI

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I question whether the Military Establishment is making full utilization and maximum use of the potentialities and talents of its available personnel. A study by the Comptroller General of the United States in 1964 estimated that about 35,000 trained enlisted personnel were misassigned throughout the Army, with the result that $48.7 million in training costs had been wasted. The study concluded that these personnel were not utilized in duties commensurate with their military or civilian training and/or experience because of a personnel management system that generated misassignments. Some examples of improper assignments that were found, are as follows:

1. A serviceman entered military service in 1950. In 1951 he attended the Army Medical School and was trained as a medical specialist which requires knowledge of ward and clinic management; routine care of patients; emergency treatment procedures; and the ability to read and interpret medical records, charts, and diagnostic reports. The serviceman received "excellent" efficiency ratings in performing these duties. In September 1960 he was assigned to the noncommissioned officers' club at Fort Lawton, Washington, as a cook-mess steward and was working there at the time of our review. The Army is currently training additional medical specialists at a cost of over $1,000 per student.

2. A serviceman attended school for about 8 weeks and was trained as an automotive repairman. He was assigned to Fort Devens, Massachusetts, and performed duties as an automotive repairman for about 5 months. In August 1962 he was assigned to the duties of a mail clerk even though his unit was not authorized a mail clerk in its table of organization. The Army is currently training automotive mechanics at several schools at an estimated cost of $1,400 each.

3. A serviceman enlisted in the Army in February 1961 for schooling as a construction draftsman. This specialty involves drawing working plans for the construction of bridges, airfields, roads, etc. He completed the course, receiving an efficiency rating of "excellent," and was assigned to Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Because there were no openings in his occupation, he was assigned to the duties of a clerk-typist. During an interview, the serviceman expressed a desire to have remained in the occupation for which he had enlisted. During fiscal year 1964 the Army has scheduled construction drafting courses of 9 weeks each for more than 400 individuals at an estimated cost of $1,200 per student.

4. A serviceman received 12 weeks of training in aircraft maintenance during 1961. He served overseas as an aircraft mechanic for 13 months and received an "excellent" efficiency rating. Upon his return to the United States, he was assigned to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Because that installation already had more aircraft mechanics than were needed, he was assigned to the duties of a clerk-typist. The Army, worldwide, is short of personnel with aircraft maintenance training and is currently training additional aircraft mechanics at a cost of about $2,000 each.

5. Prior to entering the Army in October 1961, a serviceman had earned a college degree in building construction and had worked as a civilian for 3 years with the United States Army Corps of Engineers where he performed the duties of a draftsman and

construction inspector. Upon completion of basic military training, he was assigned to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, for on-the-job training as a construction draftsman which involves drawing working plans for the construction of bridges, airfields, roads, railroads, piers, buildings, and heating and ventilating systems. Upon arrival at Fort Belvoir in January 1962, the serviceman was assigned to the duties of a clerk and subsequently to those of a clerk-typist. We interviewed the serviceman to determine what duties he was performing and whether he had ever been utilized as a construction draftsman. The serviceman stated that his principal duties were typing, filing, and a little drafting. During fiscal year 1964 the Army has scheduled construction drafting courses of 9 weeks each for more than 400 individuals at an estimated cost of $1,200 per student.

ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES OF IMPROPER UTILIZATION OF ARMY ENLISTED PERSONNEL

(NOTE.—Military training is printed in roman; duty assignments are printed in *italic.*)

FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Construction draftsman (8 weeks): *Clerk-typist.*
Clerk-typist (8 weeks): *Truck driver.*
Medical specialist (12 weeks): *Personnel clerk.*

FORT DEVENS, MASS.

Ordnance supply specialist (10 weeks): *Light vehicle driver.*
Aircraft maintenance (5 weeks): *Truck driver.*
Automotive maintenance (8 weeks): *Cook.*
Aircraft maintenance (4 weeks): *Field communications crewman.*
Clerk-typist (8 weeks): *Hobby shop.*

FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

Aircraft maintenance (13 weeks): *Clerk-typist.*
Aircraft maintenance (13 weeks): *Military policeman.*
Military policeman (8 weeks): *Physical activities specialist.*
Radar repairman (20 weeks): *Data processing repairman.*

FORT HUACHUCA, ARIZ.

Electronic instrument repair (12 weeks): *Clerk.*
Clerk (8 weeks): *Radar repairman.*
Field radio repairman (25 weeks): *Administrative specialist.*
ADPS programing specialist (10 weeks): *Light vehicle driver.*

FORT SILL, OKLA.

Tracking and plotting radar operator (8 weeks): *Clerk.*
Clerk (8 weeks): *General supply specialist.*
General supply specialist (10 weeks): *Wheel vehicle mechanic.*
Automotive repairman (14 weeks): *Duty soldier.*
Lithographic plate making (7 weeks): *Military policeman.*
Clerk (8 weeks): *Printers helper.*
Construction draftsman (8 weeks): *Personnel specialist.*

FORT LAWTON, WASH.

Clerk (8 weeks): *Light vehicle driver.*
Light vehicle driver (8 weeks): *Missile crewman.*
Medical specialist (7 weeks): *Personnel clerk.*
Machinist (12 weeks): *Missile crewman.*

FORT HOOD, TEX.

Aircraft mechanic (5 weeks): *Cook.*
Cook (8 weeks): *Infantryman.*
Track vehicle mechanic (10 weeks): *Personnel clerk.*

FORT RILEY, KANS.

Automotive recovery specialist (7 weeks): *Lifeguard.*
Missile systems repairman (7 weeks): *Clerk.*
Track vehicle mechanic (10 weeks): *Truck driver.*
Engineer parts specialist (14 weeks): *Physical activities specialist.*

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General's study found that the basis of the Army's system of assigning personnel to specific installations is the assumption that all personnel already assigned there are performing the duties of their primary military occupational specialties. Improper utilization of personnel by installation and unit commanders, however, negates the effectiveness of this system. For example, the data available to assignment authorities may indicate that a vacancy exists in a unit because no personnel were assigned with the occupational specialty needed for that vacancy. An individual with the necessary qualifications would therefore be assigned to that unit or installation. If the installation commander, however, is already utilizing another enlisted man, without the proper training, in that vacancy, this fact would not be reflected in the data available for assignment purposes until the occupational specialty of the misassigned enlisted man is changed to agree with his duties. Thus, when the newly assigned specialist reports to the installation, there is no vacancy in his specialty, and he is assigned duties other than those for which he is trained and at that point two men are misassigned.

While these practices were observed in 1964, there is no reason to believe that they have been corrected. On the contrary, I fear that misassignments probably are as great or even greater today than they ever have been.

Mr. Speaker, failure to utilize skilled personnel in occupations in which they have been trained or have had prior civilian experience results not only in unnecessary training costs, but also, in immense manpower waste. The proper utilization of servicemen should have appeal to the Defense Department economists, for this would result in tremendous financial savings. Furthermore, by increasing the efficiency of the Armed Forces, military manpower needs can be reduced substantially, so much so, that I seriously doubt whether the 2.7 million figure cited as a minimum requirement for the 1970's is a sacred one.

WARSAW GHETTO

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, before I talk about the Warsaw ghetto, I think it would be appropriate to consider the conditions out of which the uprising of 1942 emerged. It is important, I think, because the Warsaw uprising lives with us, not only as history but as a meaningful experience in the ongoing relationship between the Jewish people and the non-Jewish world. The question naturally comes to mind of whether society has changed in such a fashion that there will never again be the oppression that drove men to the desperate acts which were performed in Warsaw 25 years ago. I fear there is evidence that the changes which have transpired in the past quarter century have not been so profound that we can relegate the Warsaw ghetto uprising to history and leave it there.

I am thinking specifically of the news from Germany, the Soviet Union and even Poland. In Germany, the signs indicate that hatred is again on the rise. A neo-Nazi party is actively campaigning for support. It is not powerful and we can only pray that it will not become powerful. But it is there and it has a substantial number of loyal followers, who propagate the notion that Nazi Germany really didn't behave so badly during World War II and that Auschwitz and Treblinka are just the fiction of anti-German pamphleteers. In the Soviet Union, there are equally disquieting signs. The Jewish religion is suppressed. Jews are denied the rights given other citizens. Jews cannot emigrate to Israel. And the existence of anti-Semitism in Poland can still be documented today. For instance, the recent dedication of a monument at Auschwitz in memory of Nazi victims, found the Polish Prime Minister, himself a survivor of Auschwitz, devoting his 40-minute speech solely to the resurgence of neonazism in West Germany. The only official speaker to mention the Jewish martydom was a French Jew who spoke in French and whose views were not translated into Polish.

I am not suggesting that we are on the threshold of another wave of the kind of conditions that produced the Warsaw uprising. But I remind you of these events to convey to you that this anniversary is not simply a day of memoriam but must also be an occasion to renew vigilance. Let us enjoy what we have today in the Western World but let us not forget that we are Jews and, being Jews, that we must forever be alert to the presence of hate, the kind of destructive hate that we must resist. The kind of hate from which came that great epic of Jewish heroism, the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

After the conquest of Poland in 1940, the Germans were cognizant of two factors in their approach to the Jewish question.

First, a latent anti-Semitism already existed in Poland. Non-Aryans were tolerated but not accepted into the larger Polish community; often they were socially ostracized.

Second, the wisest tactic to be used against an enemy was "divide et impera," divide and rule. By exploiting Polish contempt of the Jew, the Germans hoped to turn Christian Pole against Jewish Pole and vice versa. If the appeal to base emotions was not sufficient, the Germans had another device ready: the death penalty to any Pole who aided or sheltered a Jew.

The Germans also had a strategy outlined for the Jews. Cleverly and systematically, they allowed the Jews to believe they were safe within their com-

munity in the Warsaw ghetto; life would go on as before. Classes were held, plays were staged, factories bustled with activity. More than that, the Germans even permitted a Jewish government, the Judenrat, and a Jewish police force, something that had never been known before in Poland.

A witness to the scene, Marie Syrkin, observed in her memoirs that "to some the ghetto even appeared as a shelter," stating that some who had escaped from Warsaw to Soviet territory, "returned to the Warsaw ghetto of their own accord. They had heard that an autonomous Jewish community had been set up in Warsaw."

Or another writer, Mary Berg, describes her reaction to the Jewish police force after 5 weeks in the ghetto:

I experience a strange and utterly illogical feeling of satisfaction when I see a Jewish policeman at a crossing—such policemen were completely unknown in pre-war Poland.

Conditions, however, were hardly idealistic and more people began to realize this with each passing day. Jews numbering 400,000 were living in cramped and squalid quarters. Food supplies ran short, typhoid fever began to spread, nerves and fear reached new heights. The slightest provocation to the Germans meant instant death. Help from Polish friends was slow in coming—an occasional package thrown over the ghetto wall, a forged document, a temporary shelter. One factor remained constant—death, whether it was from starvation or disease or bullets. In 1942, a new element was introduced: mass evacuation of the Jews. Between July and October of 1942, about 30,000 Jews were transported to Treblinka, Auschwitz, Belsen, and Majdanek.

Any illusions the Jews once held about their fate or about German policy were now dissipated. Several people had escaped from the concentration camps and came back to relate the horror they had seen. The policy of appeasement was useless. If death had to come it was best to meet it head on and to die fighting rather than to submit passively. Suddenly, the young men took over the leadership of the remaining Jews in the ghetto. They knew no lethargy and recognized no self-delusion. In a manifesto to the world, the Jewish fighting organization declared:

Every doorstep in the ghetto has become a stronghold and shall remain a fortress until the end! All of us will probably perish in the fight, but we shall never surrender. We, as well as you, are burning with the desire to punish the enemy for all his crimes, with a desire for vengeance. It is a fight for our freedom as well as yours; for our human dignity and national honor, as well as yours. We shall avenge the gory deeds of Auschwitz, Treblinka, Belsen, and Majdanek!

The Jewish fighting organization assembled the young and the strong, drilled them in defense and guerrilla tactics, dug out a system of tunnels and communication centers. All was done clandestinely, in the night, when no German dared to enter the labyrinth of the ghetto.

The will to fight had been awakened, what was direly needed next was weapons. A strong spirit was not enough to stop German tanks, Molotov cocktails might.

Weapons were bought, stolen, borrowed and then smuggled into the ghetto. Rifles sitting at the sides of German officers in barbershops were pilfered from underneath their noses. Hidden caches of arms were uncovered by resistance groups in forests and brought back into the ghetto. The Jewish fighting organization appealed to the Polish underground resistance, the Polish Government-in-exile, the Allies, the United Nations, everyone they could think of. They hoped that once resistance to the Germans commenced within the ghetto, all of Warsaw would respond to the spark and take up arms against the common enemy, the German.

The 60,000 Jews of the Warsaw ghetto were to be sorely disappointed. The Polish underground felt the time was not ripe for a large-scale resistance. Without adequate preparations and planning, resistance at this point could mean the destruction of all Warsaw. To risk the lives of so many to bolster the morale of the last remaining Jews in the ghetto was too great a cost. At best, the Poles could supply the Jewish fighting organization with some of their arms, some of their men, and as much psychological support as possible. Leaflets were issued and distributed through the underground. A Council for the Assistance to the Jews was established. These were all good measures but they were not enough.

The Polish Government-in-exile issued protests and the Allies signed a declaration denouncing Hitler's actions. Documents, however, would not save the remaining Jews in the ghetto.

On April 19, 1943, when the Germans entered the ghetto to finish their evacuation of all the Warsaw Jews, not passivity but a hail of bullets greeted them. The small number of Jews, poorly armed and new to the methods of war staged a last valiant stand which was to cost the Germans lives, morale, and prestige. A daily average of 30 German officers and 1,190 men were involved in the month-long operation, well equipped with tanks, guns and grenades against only handfuls of Jewish youth, equipped with homemade bombs and stolen guns. Tens of thousands of civilians were holed up in shelters fearfully awaiting the outcome. General Stroop was infuriated by this new development—the ghetto was to be razed to the ground. Planes shelled the crumbling walls from above, German engineers set buildings ablaze from below. By May 1943, Stroop could report with satisfaction that the Warsaw ghetto no longer existed.

Physically, the Jews were indeed vanquished, spiritually they had conquered. They had shown that the human spirit, despite horror and shock and disillusionment, could not be broken. Somewhere a will to fight, an optimistic vein lived on.

That optimistic vein, that will to live on in spite of grief and disappointment, these are the qualities that have enabled the Jewish people to survive 2,000 years in an inhospitable world. The Warsaw ghetto, 25 years ago, recalls many ages of cruelty. It also recalls many ages of determination and hope. The Warsaw ghetto must be a reminder that, no matter how comfortable life may appear, there is a lurking danger which may sweep every comfort away. It is only by remembering we are Jews, being alert to both the glories and menaces of holding on to Judaism in a non-Jewish world, that we will continue to survive as a people and to thrive.

"THE BITTER HERITAGE"

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about the history of our involvement in Vietnam. Recently Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., published a brief volume entitled "The Bitter Heritage" in which he went to some effort to disassociate the late President Kennedy from our present policy. In my judgment there has been a fundamental identity of principles from President Kennedy to President Johnson and I was pleased to see this continuity emphasized in a review of Professor Schlesinger's book in the New Leader, May 8, 1967, by Prof. I. Milton Sacks, of Brandeis University—one of the Nation's two or three outstanding authorities on Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place this item in the RECORD at this point:

CONTAINMENT IN THE POLYCENTRIST SIXTIES

("The Bitter Heritage Vietnam and American Democracy 1941–1966," by Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., Houghton Mifflin. 126 pp. $3.95. Reviewed by I. Milton Sacks, Associate Professor of Politics, Brandeis.)

Arthur Schlesinger's *The Bitter Heritage* is not so much a book as a broadside in the domestic political controversy over Vietnam. Those looking for a work of history will not find it here; the author himself has specified elsewhere that "it is too soon to expect an authoritative account of the evolution of American policy toward Vietnam." Instead, he has chosen to provide a partisan analysis of the Vietnam war and some prescriptions, loosely defined as "De-escalation," for ending it. So it is as a pamphleteer, who with more than a trace of zeal attempts to disassociate President John Kennedy from the indictment, that he advances a scathing critique of American policy which is only partially mitigated by qualifying phrases.

The analysis rests on the fundamental proposition that the American commitment to South Vietnam is a self-created one. History, according to Schlesinger, reveals that we have always been beset by "illusions" which "continue to mislead us" in dealing with Southeast Asia. The "logic of our own history . . . prescribes two tables of priorities for the United States—one based on strategic significance, the other on cultural accessibility. And by both standards Western Europe and Latin America are the parts of the world which matter most to the United States." He then speculates that: "We could survive the subjection of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Eastern Europe or Polynesia by a hostile power or ideology, but if either Western Europe or Latin America were organized against North America, our position

would be parlous indeed. And Western Europe and Latin America are the parts of the world to which a common intellectual tradition gives us a hope of reciprocal understanding."

In view of these words, one may wonder why Schlesinger so scornfully rejects the label of "neo-isolationist" which he says the "Administration has called the critics of its Vietnam policy." All the more so, since he approvingly quotes Walter Lippmann, who has specifically repudiated his own previous "one-world" concepts to denounce the alleged "global messianism" of current American policy makers.

In any event, from these premises, the rest of the argument flows easily. In World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt (correctly or mistakenly, it is not clear) regarded it a vital American interest to stop the threat to Southeast Asia of a "powerful militarist state dedicated to the establishment of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere." Once that threat disappeared, "an internal revolt of Vietnamese nationalists, even if led by Communists" did not in Schlesinger's view "threaten all Southeast Asia." Thus we are said to have mistakenly supported the French, exaggerated the danger of Chinese intervention, invented the fallacious domino theory, and after the French defeat and withdrawal drawn a line which no "vital strategic interest required . . . be drawn where it was." In fact, Schlesinger speculates that "Had Ho taken over all Vietnam in 1954, he might today be soliciting Soviet support to strengthen his resistance to Chinese pressure, and this situation, *however appalling for the people of South Vietnam*, would obviously be better for the United States than the one in which we are floundering today." (Italics mine—I.M.S.)

This is based on a provocative new theory that the "containment of national Communism in the polycentrist sixties will be very different from the containment of international Communism in the monolithic forties. . . . The most effective bulwark against an aggressive national Communist state in some circumstances may well be national Communism in surrounding states." He stops short of suggesting that the creation of such states should become a prime objective of American policy.

Returning to the realities of South Vietnam, Schlesinger notes that once the U.S. was mistakenly committed there in the aftermath of Geneva 1954, it supported President Ngo dinh Diem. He proved to be incompetent, but his misdeeds were concealed from a preoccupied President Kennedy who "accepted the cheerful reports from men in whom he had great confidence." Then an American President, having honestly promised in the 1964 election campaign not to send American boys to Asia, was driven to repudiate his pledge because he "apparently" had not allowed for "continued decay in the military situation." The bombing of North Vietnam and the increase of American troops in South Vietnam (unhappily already numbering over 15,000 in President Kennedy's day) was begun in February 1965 to avert "total collapse," although one simply does not know if the situation "was really all that grave . . . actuality or myth."

President Johnson says he seeks a negotiated settlement, but he is wedded to a bombing policy that seemingly has no justification at all other than "transient" effects, we are told. Worse still, the President has surrendered his options to the workings of "the escalation machine," which inevitably will lead to war with China, "direct Soviet entry into the war in Vietnam," and even nuclear war. Needless to add, the Vietnam war has also divided the American people, liquidated the promise of the Great Society and raised the spectre of the revival of McCarthyism. In the final chapter matters turn out to be better than portrayed, however, and Schlesinger ends on an upbeat note in the true American lecture style.

Unfortunately, in presenting his current view of American policy toward Vietnam, Schlesinger appears to have forgotten what he forcefully wrote only a short while ago. In his personal memoir, *A Thousand Days*, he attributes Hanoi's 1960 intervention in the South to the fact that "the success of Diem's economic policies convinced Ho Chi Minh that he could not wait passively for the Diem regime to collapse." The present book simply refers to the belated character of Ho Chi Minh's 1960 intervention in the South as being due to the unreliability of the Vietnamese guerrillas in 1958. In this book, too, President Kennedy was fooled by optimistic 1962 reports from American officials. In *A Thousand Days* the Australian Communist writer W. T. Burchett, was cited to show that 1962 was "Diem's year" and that "The American advisers and the helicopter war had increased the cost of guerrilla action, and the Vietcong almost reached the point of giving up in the Mekong delta and withdrawing to the mountains."

And if we are to understand Schlesinger's current view about the strategic importance of Laos and Vietnam, what are we to make of his earlier treatment of Laos in *A Thousand Days*? "For Laos had an evident strategic importance. If the Communists gained possession of the Mekong Valley they could materially intensify their pressure against South Vietnam and Thailand. If Laos was not precisely a dagger point at the heart of Kansas, it was very plainly a gateway to Southeast Asia. . . . It was essential to convince the Pathet Lao they could not win and to dissuade the Russians from further military assistance. In view of the pacifist inclinations of the Royal Laotian Army, moreover, it would be hard to induce the Pathet Lao to call off the war. . . . But as the Pathet Lao moved forward, it became a question whether Moscow could turn the local boys off even if it wanted to. In any case, the United States had no choice but to stiffen its position, whether in preparation for negotiation or for resistance."

President Kennedy then chose to send in the troops. Why was that gesture not "overcommitment," a move toward "land war in Asia" or any of the other pitfalls invoked against our policy in Vietnam?

Indeed, why was it necessary at that time for President Kennedy to affirm that "Moscow must not misjudge the American determination to stop aggression in Southeast Asia," or the height of wisdom to assert, "We must never be lulled into believing that either power (Russia or China) has yielded its ambitions for world domination. . . . I trust the United States has learned that it cannot ignore the moral and ideological principles at the root of today's struggles." Has Schlesinger really forgotten the considerations which led President Kennedy to emphasize American limited war capabilities?

Anyone reading only this book would never know that Schlesinger had earlier concluded, as a final judgment on President Kennedy: "No doubt he realized that Vietnam was his great failure in foreign policy." Nor is Schlesinger's position any clearer when one looks back at the introduction he wrote for *The Politics of Escalation in Vietnam*, whose thesis he now apparently accepts uncritically. At that time he said of the authors, "They do not, in my judgment, give due weight to military necessities that at times have rendered an enlarged American role imperative, nor do they always see that negotiation gestures out of Hanoi can be exercises in political warfare too. . . ." Would that this sentence had found a place in *The Bitter Heritage!*

Nor is it helpful in understanding the Vietnam situation for Schlesinger to resurrect the old chestnut about the military: "The Joint Chiefs of Staff, of course, by definition argue for military solutions. They are the most fervent apostles of 'one more step.' That is their business, and no one should be surprised that generals behave like generals." It is particularly unhelpful when he goes on to cite General Ridgeway, General Gavin and others where it suits his purpose and finally to ask, "Why had our military leaders not long ago freed themselves from the omnipotence of air power, so cherished by civilians who think war can be won on the cheap?"

All of this is not to deny that there is much of value in Schlesinger's indictment. We are in a difficult situation in Vietnam and he has correctly identified many errors made in the past that plague us today. But one is forced to deplore his failure to practice what he preaches. He quite properly "hates to see intellectuals and liberals preparing the way for a new McCarthyism by debasing the level of public discussion and substituting stereotypes for sense and rage for reason." Why then attack Dean Rusk for believing in the monolithic character of Communism when the State Department has not held that view for a number of years?

Of course, Schlesinger offsets the logic of some of his own positions by opposing simple withdrawal and recognizing that "military action plays an indispensable role in the search for a political solution." He even goes so far as to affirm that "We must have enough American armed force in South Vietnam to leave no doubt in the minds of our adversaries that a Communist government will not be imposed on South Vietnam by force."

But the main thrust of his arguments, unfortunately, stems from his basic position that our commitment in Vietnam was wrong to begin with, and that all of our actions should be guided by George Kennan's judgment that "There is more respect to be won in the opinion of this world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than by the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or compromising objectives." The debate Schlesinger has joined will find its ultimate resolution in the future as a consequence of the sacrifices that brave Americans are making in the defense of South Vietnamese freedom, and peace and stability in Southeast Asia. We shall all see whether in accomplishing that objective, we have indeed won more respect in the opinion of the world.

ROBERTSON: 20 YEARS AS CHIEF PAGE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives under the direction of William M. "Fishbait" Miller has a very capable and efficient staff. It is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members a recent article in the Roll Call commending a very important and capable staff member, Turner Robertson, majority chief House page:

ROBERTSON: 20 YEARS AS PAGE

(By Lorraine Petty)

Turner N. Robertson, celebrating his 28th year on Capitol Hill, says the House Page System hasn't changed much, in the 20 years he has served as Minority and Majority Chief Page.

There are still exactly 50 pages, although the current group is a little older. They still run errands for House Members and they still work long hours and follow the same procedures, under the supervision of Robertson and Tom Tear, present House Minority Chief Page.

But Robertson, after these twenty years, may see major changes in the page system. The Congressional Reorganization bill, now before the House, would require pages to be high school graduates. House pages now must be at least high school juniors. If the measure is passed, the Capitol Page School would be phased out, as present pages graduate.

Lack of after-hours supervision and long working hours for the young boys, plus Congressional reluctance to authorize spending for a new school-dormitory, led to the new minimum age proposal.

Critics say unexpected problems may result from raising the age, without increasing the number of pages.

At 18, they point out, boys are usually either headed for college or the draft. Finding page applicants then might be difficult.

Others wonder whether college students could spare enough time to work the long hours required by Congress. Current pages go to classes from 6:45 AM to 9:45 AM and are on duty the rest of the day until the House adjourns. Even part-time college students couldn't arrange such early class hours. Two shifts of 50 pages each, might be necessary if college students were used.

Some critics also suggest college students might not be quite as enthusiastic about performing menial tasks.

The tasks, according to Robertson, have remained the same, over the past 20 years, but the workload has increased. The physical number of pieces of legislative materials has increased and pages now cover a wider territory since the Rayburn HOB and the New Senate Office Building were built. "Service is still satisfactory," says Robertson, "but not as quick."

Pages duties include placing under each Member's chair, copies of the Congressional Record and all bills, reports, hearings and other materials related to legislation up each day for House consideration. Thereafter, pages await the call of House members, who ask them to pick up and deliver a vast assortment of items (all within the Capitol Hill complex).

Robertson, who supervises the 30 pages serving Democratic House members, came to Capitol Hill April 6, 1939. For the next 10 years, he held a series of patronage jobs under Rep. John H. Kerr (NC).

Then House Minority Leader Sam Rayburn (Tex) appointed him Chief Minority Page on Jan. 1, 1947. He became House Chief Majority Page when Rayburn was made Speaker; then reappointed by current Speaker John W. McCormack (Mass).

A number of his former charges became Members or Hill aides. Rep. David Pryor (Ark) was once a page under Robertson's supervision, as was former Rep. Jed Johnson (Okla). Robertson also recalls two Congressional staffers who were once in his charge—Lee McElvain (Aspinall, Colo) and John Henry (Pryor, Ark).

THE CUBAN HOAX AT EXPO '67

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the next few days, newspapers throughout the country will focus attention on the opening of Expo '67, the World's Fair marking the Canadian centennial. One exhibit which is bound to attract much attention is that sponsored by the Castro Government of Cuba. Indeed, in yesterday's New York Times, an article by John Lee pointed out that U.S. citizens visiting the fair can "enjoy Havana cigars or Cuban rum drinks" even though the purchase of such items "either for consumption in Canada or import into the United States would constitute technical violation of a law prohibiting trading with the enemy."

Communist bloc nations have in the past used such international exhibitions for propaganda purposes; Expo '67, to be sure, will be no exception and, in fact, will offer the Cuban Government its first opportunity to show off its wares at an exhibit of this type in the free world. A poignant statement by Mr. Inocente Andrés Collazo Toledo has been brought to my attention. It concerns, among other things, the outright deceit which has been employed by the Castro regime in assembling its exhibit.

Mr. Collazo formerly served as the representative of Cuban Chartering Enterprises in London, a post he had held since January of 1964. His responsibility in that post was to charter free world vessels for the Cuban sea trade—not an easy task in view of the effectiveness of the Maritime Administration's blacklisting and the boycott action of Western Hemisphere dockworkers against vessels involved in the Cuban trade.

Last month Mr. Collazo asked for—and was granted—political asylum by the U.S. Embassy in the British capital. In the aforementioned statement, given to the Economic Research Bureau of the Movimiento Unidad Revolucionaria, he points out that, while he was serving in London, he came into contact with a Cuban official whose mission in London was to purchase stereo components to be displayed at the Montreal fair as Cuban-manufactured consumer items. The deceit is further compounded by the fact that not even the wood for the cabinets to house the stereo equipment is of Cuban origin; the latter was purchased in the Congo. Thus, a non-Cuban item will be displayed as if it were entirely of Cuban manufacture.

Worse still is the fact that to the casual observer it will appear that such items are available to all Cuban citizens. This could not be further from the truth. As Mr. Collazo states:

> The government will display a number of Cuban products [which] the Cuban people have never heard of.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all of our colleagues should take time to read Mr. Collazo's statement as its scope is much broader than just Cuban participation at Expo '67. He confirms the effectiveness of our policy of virtually isolating Cuba economically and, at the same time, he adds emphasis to the widely held belief that the Cuban economy is in a completely chaotic state. I trust that all of our colleagues will afford themselves the opportunity of reading the statement by Mr. Collazo.

Mr. Collazo's statement follows:

STATEMENT

My name is Inocente Andrés Collazo Toledo and in January 1964 I was appointed CUFLET (Cuban Chartering Enterprise) Representative in London, England, a position I held until March 1967, when I defected.

When I left Cuba in January 1964 I left behind a bad situation, both in the political aspect and in the economic aspect, but some of us still doubted that this was the end of the Revolutionary promises we had heard; some of us still had some hope.

In December 1965 I returned to Havana for a two month vacation and this is when I realized how bad things really were, because although reports reaching me in London described the situation, they fell short of the real picture I had the opportunity to see.

Scarcity was widespread. Little food and less variety even among Cuban crops, no shoes, no cloth. I arrived in Cuba just after Castro's announcement about the free exit; he had said in September that all those who wanted to leave the country could do so without fear of reprisals and that he would set up facilities in Matanzas province in order that those having relatives abroad could be picked up.

I guess that Castro had figured that a few thousand would take advantage of his offer, but I am sure he never realized what the true situation was. From his point of view, it would be an embarrassing situation for the United States, but his offer became a boomerang that came back and hit him. For a moment it seemed that everyone was going to leave, so the government started to make it tough for those who wanted out.

These measures were not even popular with government officials, because everyone had some relatives who had applied for exit permits and papers and who had therefore been fired from his job. For one, I had the opportunity of getting a close look at these measures as my own sister had applied for an exit permit and I witnessed the treatment she received from the authorities. For example, when they went to her home to make the inventory of the furniture she was kicked out of the place and not even the food on the stove was she allowed to take with her as she left. The government officials shouted at her when after interviewing her to see if she wanted to remain, she refused and insisted on leaving. Thank heavens she was able to reach the United States and now, after more than three years we have been reunited here in Miami.

I returned to London completely frustrated with the Revolution and convinced that whatever hopes or even dreams I had had before were impossible. I was sorry for all those left behind in Cuba. By February 1967 I had reached a determination: I had to break loose from the Cuban government and I would ask for political asylum from the United States Embassy. It had taken me some time to reach this decision. I had had my doubts and I had been concerned for the uncertainties of the immediate future. But, I could not postpone abandoning my post any longer. I had to take this step, and now I am very happy to have taken it.

This is a summary of the mental processes through which I went before defecting and about the present tyranny that enslaves the Cuban People. I could of course mention its evils, its constant abuses, and its disregard for the dignity of man. I suppose that every one of my fellow countrymen who reach freedom can write a book of his own about this, so I will not extend myself on this subject. However, I am more than happy to answer any questions along this line.

With regard to the economic situation of Cuba, there are a number of facts I came across during the time I was CUFLET Representative in London. I will not refer to all of them, but I will point out some and later on I will be more than pleased to answer related questions.

CUFLET

My task was to charter free world vessels for the Cuba sea trade in order to cover the deficit resulting from the shortage of Cuban and Communist Bloc vessels to handle the volume of trade, and I can add that my task was not an easy one.

The number of shipping firms that are willing to deal with the Cuban government is very limited. The measures taken by the U.S. Government through the "Black List" set up by the Maritime Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce is felt throughout the free world shipping circles.

The boycott action decreed by the dock-workers of this Hemisphere against vessels flying the colors of countries involved in the Cuba trade has also had its effects. As soon as the boycott started some British shipping firms that were at the time considering the possibility of entering into the Cuba sea trade, but that also had regular routes to Latin America, cancelled any such plans.

Another source of harassment are the reports on the Cuban economic situation and free world shipping with Cuba released by Cuban exile organizations. For example, I had the opportunity of seeing several of the newsletters and releases of Unidad Revolucionaria, especially those concerned with shipping. I remember that when Unidad Revolucionaria put out the exposé about Tsavliris shipping firm that firm called me and said: "Here, look at what your friends from Miami keep sending us". Tsavliris is one of the very few free world shipping firms presently chartering vessels to the Cuban government, and thanks to this trade he (Georgios Tsavliris) has been able to expand his maritime business, because after starting out with only two or three vessels he now operates about 12 and has started a salvage enterprise with bases in Greece and the Azores.

When I was in London, most of the charters were made with the following companies: Tsavliris (Tsavliris Shipping Ltd.), Frangistas (Franco Shipping Co. Ltd.), Vlassopulos (Vlassopulos Ltd.), Livanos (John Livanos & Sons Ltd.), Purvis Shipping (Purvis Shipping Co. Ltd.), and Walter Runciman & Co.

Up to 1965 I handled almost 100% of the charters made by the Cuban government through the London CUFLET office. But after that, one of the Greek shipping firms (Frangistas) started to deal directly with CUFLET's Havana office. My experience was that these types of operators charge 20 to 30% over the current charter prices, thus making money at Castro's expense since he has to depend on them for trade transport even if they charge more and even if they use old World War II vessels that suffer constant breakdowns like in the recent case of the Newglad and Newmoat—both belonging to Tsavliris—while on their way to the Persian gulf in December 1966.

Things are worse. I already had received news in London about the measures taken by the Greek government against shipowners and captains of vessels involved in the Cuba sea trade, and to my understanding the owners and captains of the following Greek vessels have been brought to Court: Irene, Barbarino, Alice, Pantanassa, Roula Maria, Sofia, Tina, Eftychia, Andromachi, Kyra Hariklia, Nikolas F., and Nikolis M.

Just as I defected I heard that Frangistas was trying to back away from the Cuba sea trade despite the fact that in 1966 he had visited Havana personally and had promised that the vessels he would be receiving from the Soviet Union would be placed in charter to CUFLET, as was the case of the first one, the Eftychia.

MAMBISAS

Through my work with CUFLET I came in contact with Mambisas (the official Cuban government shipping enterprise). Mambisas has its European offices in Rotterdam, Holland, but they came to CUFLET in London for freight and charters, because many of their return trips to Cuba from the far East were made in ballast.

The new Spanish-built vessels have helped out, but to our surprise, they suffered numerous breakdowns. Further, the defection of 42 officers and crewmembers (including 6 Masters and 10 Chief Engineers) has jeopardized the operation of the merchant fleet.

The Cuban government has been unable to train qualified personnel to replace the officers who have defected. A good example on how this affects the enterprise is the problem with the diesel and fuel oils. Fuel oil is cheaper, much cheaper, than diesel oil; yet, the Cuban vessels have to use diesel oil because their engineers are incapable of operating the ship with fuel oil.

The present partial solution adopted by Mambisas has been to hire eight Soviet Masters, eight Engineers, and fifteen Mates to operate the Cuban vessels.

TRADE

I am no economist or trade expert, but having been three years in London in a Cuban government enterprise I was able to come across numerous government officials who went by and sat with me for a while. And on these occasions we would discuss Cuba. Besides, my trips to Cuba gave me a good insight.

The Cuban economy is in chaos. Let me tell you how things are played up for propaganda purposes. I remember that in 1965 when I was in Havana the authorities were getting ready to hold the Tri-Continental Conference. The government was very busy tidying up the main streets through which the delegates would be taken: La Rampa, Malecón, Galiano, Reina, Monte, Belascoain, and others. It was more or less what they do in Hollywood in the pictures. The set was a facade. The few products available were displayed in the shop-windows, and when no products were available huge revolutionary posters in gay colors were the substitute. You should have seen the streets a block away—empty as ever.

A similar show is the one that the Cuban government is now attempting to put up at the Expo 67 fair in Canada. The government will display a number of Cuban products the Cuban People have never heard of. I met an official who had gone to England to purchase some "Garrard" record-player equipment with which to build several consoles and display them as part of Cuban export products.

To give you an idea about the whole situation, let us take the case of the record-players. The equipment will be purchased in England and even the wood will be imported and for this purpose the Cuban government is now holding talks with Congolese officials (Brazzaville). Hardly a Cuban industry.

Of course, coffee, meat, lobster, fruits, and vegetables—not available for consumption in Cuba—will be available.

It is my own conclusion that Cuban government officials—with the exception of Castro—are convinced that the sugar industry will be unable to pull the country out of the economic crisis, so they are attempting to export anything as long as it means a hard currency revenue: meat (to Italy and Spain), lobsters, fruit and vegetables, furniture, coffee, and the record-players. Not to mention sugar and tobacco.

From talking with other Cuban officials I also concluded that no one knows where the government is heading, nor do they understand what is happening nor what will happen in the future. Perhaps they are too close to see reality. Perhaps they are too much involved in their daily work.

Luckily, I am out of there!

THE TEACHER CORPS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, recently, a poor youngster in Dade County, Fla., was asked what he thought of a class run by members of the Teacher Corps.

"I like it in that class," was the child's reply. "I'm smarter in there."

That comment from a problem student in a low-income school in Florida illustrates some of the findings of a recent study of the Teacher Corps conducted by the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children.

The Council has found:

Positive warm personal rapport between adult and child is invariably an element in the disadvantaged child's success in the classroom.

This "rapport" is the secret ingredient in the success of the Teacher Corps. The main value of the Corps, according to the Council:

It is an instrument for harnessing the idealism of an unusual group of young people who, but for the Corps, would never have been drawn to the teaching profession. In apparent contrast to the majority of certified teachers, these young people prefer to work with the special challenge of disadvantaged schools. Through the Teacher Corps, they can put their dedication and their abilities to work in the service of the Nation, the school, and the needy child.

The findings of this national study were graphically depicted in schools in my own State of Florida. A newspaperman working for the Miami Herald described a Teacher Corps man in Dade County as "so excited about teaching you'd think he invented it."

They may not have invented teaching, but they have helped many children discover "how to feel smarter in class."

Each Teacher Corps project in the Nation can show they have succeeded, show where their zeal has excited young minds into accepting the challenge of learning for the first time.

Soon to come before us is the legislation that would enable Teacher Corps men to carry on this invaluable work, and to go into more of the slum schools in our blighted neighborhoods. I would encourage my colleagues to think of the Corps not as a faceless fellowship program, but a dedicated army of young teachers who want to reach these problem children and show them that the way out of their poverty is by learning.

The National Teacher Corps—

Says the Advisory Council's report—

is too badly needed and too promising to be either discontinued or treated as a tempo-

rary stopgap. Of all the present investments of public effort, few are likely to yield so large a return.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Mrs. Janet Dean, president, Dade County Classroom Teachers Association. Mrs. Dean's letter indicates the strong support that the National Teacher Corps is receiving among its colleagues.

The letter follows:

DADE COUNTY CLASSROOM TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
April 10, 1967.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to share with you our concern for the future of the National Teacher Corps. Perhaps I can best do this by bringing you to date on the contribution being made by the NTC teams here in Miami.

Florida has only ten of the special NTC teams—seven in Dade County and three in Broward—working in conjunction with the School of Education at the University of Miami. Every indication that we have points to the success of these special teaching teams. We feel that one of the most valuable contributions made by the program is the experience and training it provides for the intern teacher—training that is not available in any school of education. Student teachers generally learn how to teach the middle-class child. In general, teaching texts are also pointed toward the average middle-class student. As a result, no teacher is ever really prepared for what he will find in teaching the disadvantaged child and few for the gifted child.

The intern teachers we now have in the NTC program in Dade County tell us they are getting superb training. Even more important perhaps, the teachers of the classes from which the children who work with the NTC teams are selected, tell us the real test of success is met. We have learned that the real test is not what happens in the special class, but what happens when the child returns to his regular classroom. A second grade teacher in one of our Dade County Schools sent fourteen of her pupils to the NTC classes. She said, "When they returned, ten were able to continue with the regular studies while four continued to need special attention. But the biggest change has been in the children's attitude. They are much more interested in learning." One of the children who had attended a special NTC class said, "I like to be here. I'm smart in here."

This change in attitude about himself may be the most important contribution any teacher can make to a child who is not successful in school or in society. We are becoming increasingly aware that the difficulty in learning to read is just one part of the complex problem the teacher faces when working with the disadvantaged child. We find that before he can learn to read, he must learn to value reading and before he can value reading, he must learn to value himself.

President Johnson's proposal to extend and enlarge the Teacher Corps is very heartening to all of us who are concerned with and about children. I would urge you to do whatever possible to support the expansion and funding of the National Teacher Corps.

The Dade County Classroom Teachers' Association appreciates your support of education. You will be pleased to know that our present membership of 7,800 continues to make us the largest local association in the nation and I am sure I send the good wishes of our membership to you as I send my own.

Sincerely,

JANET DEAN,
President.

A REPORT ON THE JOB CORPS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Tom Campbell, publisher of Iron Age, the national metalworking weekly, has spent considerable time and effort studying the Job Corps. He has visited a number of centers and talked with both officials and Job Corps enrollees. His editorial and article, "Industry and Job Corps Salvage America's Rejected Youth," presents a comprehensive look at the Job Corps.

I urge all Members to read these articles, which follow:

THE JOB CORPS PAYS OFF: BY RE-CREATING HUMAN DIGNITY!

(By Tom Campbell)

If you are hidebound in your opinion that industry and government can't work together in some areas, forget this piece. And don't read the one inside on the Job Corps either.

But if you believe in miracles, be with us for a little while. If you don't believe what you read at least you will be shaken up. That we guarantee.

Perhaps your first thought was—as was ours—that the Job Corps was a mammoth leaf-raking boondoggle. Most of us let it go at that. Some columnists, editors, hatemongers, youth detractors and hostile people condemned something they knew nothing about.

We had a second thought. It stemmed from the lucky breaks we had along the road of life since 1923. Then, Herb Graham, chief inspector at the Southside plant of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. (who later was research vice president) gave us our first chance. Since then we have known hundreds of men who would have said, "Hire that guy?" But he did; and we got our start.

Later, Dr. Donald A. Laird, Psychology Dept., Colgate University told us, "Tom you can always break into print if you chew hell out of something 'different.' If you have a message based on fact and good will, chances are few—if any—will listen to you." It's still true today.

We checked, interviewed, read thousands of words, saw copies of letters from Corpsmen, looked over the guys running the show, analyzed the budgets, threw quickies at the brains of the setup, made several fellows miserable, changed our own ideas often—and came away convinced.

We were convinced that something that should not have happened—according to sterile, formal and prejudiced rules—not only happened, but it worked. And man, if something works to the benefit of all, don't flyspeck it, argue with it or waste time trying to discredit it. If you do, you will find your "listeners" are "out to lunch."

In case you didn't know it, top industrial companies have contracted to make the Job Corps a success. With the help of government Job Corps people, American industrial giants have succeeded in giving dignity, jobs and a purpose to society's castoffs.

The success has been so strong spiritually—as well as economically—it is living proof of modern day miracles.

INDUSTRY AND JOB CORPS SALVAGE AMERICA'S REJECTED YOUTH

(The Job Corps has been called everything from a boondoggle to a Federal reform school. And, from past experience, was a predictable failure. But it isn't a failure—for one reason: People.)

(By Tom Campbell [1])

"The Job Corps has been called the greatest sociological experiment of the century. This project not only teaches marketable skills, but also creates an entirely new environment for dropouts . . . The Federal government, I believe, was wise in soliciting industry to help in solving that particular problem. We have the capital, the manpower, the skills, technology and the desire to get the job done." (Harold S. Geneen, president ITT.)

Take a youngster 16 to 21 years old. He (or she) is a dropout and unemployed. He (or she) probably comes from a broken family—or no family at all. Maybe a police record is involved. He (or she) may be alienated or hostile—or both.

Who cares? Few people, if anyone. Schools want him to conform. Society calls two strikes against him right off the bat; and watches like a hawk. Many companies spurn him—and naturally he spurns them. In many cases we studied, he rejects himself.

Someone Cares. He hears about the Job Corps. Its camps are, in most cases, run by the biggest corporations in the nation. The United States Employment Service looks him over. He gets accepted.

He or she is cleaned, screened and told what's what by a counselor who has been picked by the company and approved, aided, and briefed by the Job Corps.

Now, someone does care—maybe for the first time. This is his first real chance to be salvaged. Or as Vice President Humphrey says, "It may be his only and last chance."

Industry's Role. The boys go to one of 11 major camps, each run by a civilian contractor; of these, nine are large business companies, one is a joint university-company venture and the other is run by a state agency. Unique, eh? Especially when one is led to believe that universities are interested in youth?

The girls go to one of 14 camps or centers, most of which are run by American business companies. Both the men's and girls' camps are urban organizations.

In addition to these are conservation camps where $38 million dollars in conservation has been accomplished already. And besides conservation, these boys are taught trades and educated.

"It is still too early to judge, but we assume, based on our experience, any reasonable degree of success of the Job Corps program will be one of the best investments America could make."

And, "70% of these boys at Camp Parks came from families on relief. Furthermore, 40% of their grandparents were also on relief. If we can break that cycle and can make them tax producers, instead of tax consumers, we have added greatly to the strength of America." (Charles B. Thornton, board chairman, Litton Industries.)

Stick-to-It Rate. Of this major group of society's "we-don't-want-them," about 70% stick to the Job Corps until "graduated." They are trained for a trade, reach for a high school diploma (and get it), become

---

[1] Inside for the Story:

For nearly all of his working life, Tom Campbell has earned his living only one way—by knowing people; knowing what motivates them and why; knowing how they'll react and why; in short, knowing them from the inside—not just the outside.

He spent seven years in industrial and employee relations with Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania. This only whetted his appetite for people. He has spent the last 31 years writing about them for Iron Age. And along the way, he has been active in various youth groups.

The result of all of these experiences is this intensely personal report on the Job Corps.

a forester, return to school, go to work for the Corps or join the Service. Recently a fellow classed as a stupe by his former pals, his former school, and by many others, landed a job as cook for a large Corps camp. Today he makes more than his dad, is happy and is completely salvaged.

Latest figures compiled (and audited) a few weeks ago show: 4637 or 73% of the Corpsmen have jobs because of rehabilitation and teaching at the camps; 1115 or 18% are in the Service and 594 or 9% went back to school after being upgraded by the Job Corps.

PROFILE OF A TYPICAL ENROLLEE ENTERING THE JOB CORPS

Education: Reading score: 4.7 grade level; Years of school: 7

Health: 80% have never seen a Doctor or Dentist; 7 lb underweight.

Previous Behavior: 63% no previous record; 27% minor anti-social behavior; 10% had 1 serious conviction.

Family Pattern: 45% from broken home; 65% from family where head of household unemployed; 50% from families on relief.

Earning Capacity: 90% unemployed; 10% employed at an average of 80¢ hour.

About $140 million worth of contracts held by leading business companies are now in effect. A profit of around 4.5% is realized after the bugs are out. A hardnosed accounting department in the Office of Economic Opportunity goes over the bills and budgets of the Job Corps with a fine tooth comb—and a magnifying glass. Result: an outfit as tightly run as any business.

The Dropouts. Before I forget; many will want to know what happens to the 30% "lost" souls who can't make the grade in the Job Corps? Remember all Job Corps acceptances were taken off the bottom of the totem pole—white and non-white. Here's a rundown on the dropouts:

1. Sixty percent of the dropouts were indirectly helped by their short stay in the Corps. They either went back to school or got a job as a result of their short "adoption."

2. Thirty percent of the dropouts were referred to proper psychiatric, psychological or hospital centers. Half have been salvaged and are on their way to becoming taxpaying members of society; something that wouldn't have happened if they hadn't joined Job Corps in the first place.

3. Of the remaining 10% of Job Corps dropouts, most had eye, teeth and medical corrections and are now telling their sisters and brothers, "Maybe I didn't make the grade, but if you have any sense or guts you better stay in school or you will wind up an outcast and a complete failure."

Personal Approach. One good reason why the Job Corps has such a personal and practical communication with former Corpsmen is due to Dr. David Gottlieb, an associate director of Job Corps. He flits in and out of camp after camp—and doesn't miss a trick.

This guy is trusted and liked by the entire Corps. Some people in education don't care too much for Dr. Gottlieb because of his unorthodox teaching ideas. (He got his Ph.D. in Sociology so as not to upset his educated family, almost all of whom were big domes and successful Ph.D.'s and what have you.)

Dave sees that Corpsmen are trained, taught and cared for at their learning pace and as individuals. That's the main difference between the JC and school.

In the latter you toe the mark as a member of the "group". If you don't, you get the can tied to you, pushed ahead because of physical size or get disgusted and drop out of school. When you do that you are a dead duck, an outcast and a ready pigeon for the police blotter, skid row, drug addiction or human degradation.

From the Top, Down. Dr. Gottlieb ought to know this. He was a dropout himself. Before he went back to school (and eventually got his degrees, wrote books about kids, and became a down-to-earth consultant on youngsters) he went through what they go through: Broke, a bum, a seaman, a cook or a job at anything that made a few bucks. So he knows all the "things" to expect—and correct.

What's that you say? "Why didn't—or doesn't industry come out and yack about its success?"

Some do. But they were scared stiff—at first. They worried about the effect on their image, etc.

But Litton Industries, General Electric, Westinghouse, U.S. Industries, IBM, Federal Electric, Thiokol, RCA, Burroughs, Xerox and others are 100% for JC. They ought to be: They learned how to make it work. Their originial top kicks are strong for it and they can't let go of a tiger—if they wanted to.

Implicit Trust. About the "horror"stories and the "scandals" and the fights, etc? What would you expect from a group that society as much as told to go to hell and burn? Dandies?

You can match the small minority of JC troublemakers (who come out okay in the end) with any underprivileged, privileged or overprivileged group in San Francisco, Rochester, Pittsburgh, Cleveland or any other "nice" place. I know. I've been there.

When I went to the main headquarters in Washington, to shake out some of the answers to the questions I had about the Job Corps project, one thing stuck out: The informality and the implicit trust the various people had in each other.

FANCY—AND FACTS

Certain myths and errors have grown up around Job Corps during the past two years. Here are the most common errors and the facts.

1. The high cost of Job Corps training.

Fact: Present costs range from $6090 for nine months (the average length of stay) to $8120 for a year; next year, these will drop to $5825 and $7765. These costs include everything—capital costs, administration, food, clothing, transportation, medical and dental care, pay and allowances. Common misstatement is that Job Corps costs more than college. However, college tuition is only about a third of the cost of a year's college education, with rest made up by grants and endowments. College tuition does not cover many items included in Job Corps costs.

2. Job Corpsmen don't stay in the program.

Fact: More than 70 out of every 100 complete their training. Retention rate is remarkable in view of dropout history of Job Corps volunteers and compares favorably with other school programs.

3. Corpsmen riot and are in constant trouble with the law.

Fact: The arrest rate for all Job Corpsmen since program began is about 3.5%, which compares with the national average of 6.5% for this age group. The number of "incidents" involving Corpsmen and women has been relatively low but any fracas involving them gets undue attention in press.

4. Corpsmen shouldn't get legal service in case of trouble.

Fact: Job Corps believes its volunteers are entitled to the same basic protection of bail and representation as all other Americans. Bail is paid for by the Corpsmen; maximum limits are set on legal fees and Corpsmen also pay part of this.

5. Job Corps staff members are paid unusually high salaries.

Fact: Job Corps salaries are carefully scrutinized. It must be remembered that Job Corps teaching is year-round, often week-long, with few fringe benefits and no tenure, compared with 9 to 10 month years of conventional teachers.

6. A new program is not needed; let the regular schools do it or have industry train them.

Fact: Most Job Corps volunteers are youngsters that regular schooling could not reach for one reason or another. Completely new techniques and materials are needed to teach them. Many require reading and arithmetic teaching before they can be taught work skills; most need to be taught proper work habits and attitudes, and need the motivation to go on.

7. There are plenty of jobs; let these youngsters find them.

Fact: Uneducated and undereducated, untrained, these young people do not have the tools to find and hold meaningful, regular work. Less than 10% had worked before coming to Job Corps, although nearly all had looked. Most worked short-term or part-time jobs. Without Job Corps or a similar program, most of these young people would remain on the human slag heap, winding up on welfare or in a correctional institution. The modest investment in these young people will be repaid many times over when they become working, taxpaying, self-sufficient citizens.

"I think that jobless youth is a problem that belongs to America—not to government, not to education, not to charities; but to America as a whole As a consequence, I think that part of that responsibility rests squarely on industry.

"It seems to me that economically, any investment to get these youngsters off the street, and proud of themselves, and earning, is certainly worthwhile for all of us." Thomas J. Watson, Jr., board chairman, IBM.

Most unusual. After 31 years in the reporting business, this struck me as quite unusual in either government or business.

So much did this bother me—in view of the concrete evidence of the success now being realized—that I bugged Dr. Gottlieb unmercifully. The air was pretty hot for a while.

The truth was finally out. Dr. Gottlieb, his bosses in Washington, and the counselors and head guys in the camps do what they think is best. They're not hamstrung by a set of fancy rules made up by someone in an ivory tower.

This applies even to the public affairs department—another name for public relations. Most of the guys and gals there are former hard-nosed newspaper people who give you what you ask for. There wasn't anybody sitting on their shoulders Okaying what they said—or asking them why they said it, and why they let an outside reporter run ragged through their department.

Analysis of the first 5,000 placements: [1]

	Percent
Occupations	70.1
Professional, technical, managerial, etc.	3.1
Clerical	7.2
Service	12.6
Farming, fishery, forestry, etc.	5.2
Processing	3.6
Machine trades	8.0
Bench work	6.5
Structural work	14.4
Armed Forces	20.2
School	9.7

[1] Average hourly wage of those on jobs is $1.71 per hour, compared with 80 cents an hour by the less than 10% who worked before coming into the Job Corps.

About 60% of those placed in jobs came from the men's urban centers.

Good—or Else. It was pretty clear to them that your reporter was going to write as he saw it.

But there still was some ingredient that was responsible for the thing that made the project click. It was true that some Senators tried to put the blocks to the Job Corps—because of integration—but this failed. It's true that Vice President Humphrey not only knew what was going on, but he put the

full weight of his office and that of several Senators squarely behind the project.

What Makes It Click. After about 3½ hours of sweaty yakkity yak, we found the missing ingredient. Sergeant Shriver—the top bananaman—decided early in the game that the Job Corps could never get off the ground if it was bogged down by griping, partisan criticism and some good old political torpedo activity.

Mr. Shriver knew his way around before he hit the government. He was smart enough to realize that if he took full heat from newspapers, reporters, Congressmen, and those who would rather die than see integration, the Job Corps idea would not only work, but business companies could get the bugs out and realize a payoff.

Seeing Is Believing. A visitor who knows his onions can sense that his particular project has a minimum amount of fly-specking instructions and ruses set up by people who wouldn't know a person from a hole in the ground—especially the kind of rejects they get into the Job Corps.

You have to see it to believe it. Once you read hundreds of letters from fellows who a year ago didn't amount to a hill of beans to themselves or society, you are sure business and government can cooperate on any project which requires fresh, new, and trial-and-error thinking.

The test: Does it work? The answer: After a thorough check by this writer. Yes!

THE TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS WAR

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last week, in extension of my remarks, I obtained leave to print chapter 8 of the ignominious prowar report against Africa, devised by the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace.

While this foundation is tax free and contributes nothing to relieve the tax burden borne by our people, it is not hesitant in calculating how much tax money and even the number of casualties—American boys—we should sacrifice in any military measures against our friends in South Africa.

If this anti-American front can use its billions, without being a good taxpayer, to tell us where to spend our money and get our boys killed, something smells in New York and Washington, D.C.

This outfit has also dreamed up the new educational TV monster—also tax free. What will it teach—hate Africans and where to do war to appease its insatiable appetite? Congress needs to act, and fast, to eliminate these alien foundations from tax exemption and to investigate warmongering activities. They are a danger to freemen the world over—hiding behind such a fancy title as "International Peace." Andrew Carnegie would turn over in his grave if he were to see the shenanigans being suggested against the people by these "police state liberals."

I include the appendix to the Carnegie booklet on "Apartheid" be printed following my remarks:

APPENDIX—COLLECTIVE MILITARY MEASURES: SOME CALCULATIONS

In Chapter 7, figures were cited as to the estimated costs of various kinds of collective measures and as to estimated casualties. The manner in which these estimates were derived are described in this Appendix.

COST ANALYSIS

Cost estimates of a contemplated operation would be an essential part of the overall planning by a United Nations force staff. Each operation would have to be examined in minute detail in order to arrive at aggregative cost data. These in turn could be used for assessment purposes. Admittedly any cost analysis would rely heavily upon past experiences and involve many crude estimates. Nevertheless, some attention to costing is necessary to appreciate the magnitude of financial resources required. Furthermore the costs themselves would be an element in the policy formulation stage.

In this section, cost data of a *type* blockade force and a *type* military force will be estimated. Ascertaining the costs of all contemplated operations would be beyond the purposes of this study.[1]

The United States experience in the Cuban quarantine provides an illustrative example to formulate criteria for blockade costs against South Africa. These figures are crude estimates of the costs incurred by the United States during the entire period of the Cuban quarantine. According to Admiral Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations during the period, "some 180 ships were directly involved at the height of the Cuban operation."[2] The total estimated cost of the naval operations (including naval air units) for the 28 days in which the quarantine was in effect was approximately $44,500,000.[3] *The New York Times* estimated that the warships actually on station during the blockage period included 3–5 aircraft carriers and a total of 40–50 other warships.[4] (The differences between the *Times* account and that of the *Hearings* was presumably in the number of auxiliary and support ships involved. The 180 ships probably refers to the total ships, including support and auxiliary vessels.)

It is interesting to note that the Cuban coastline is approximately 1,600 miles (that of South Africa, approximately 1,800 miles). The blockade was a partial one, e.g., a quarantine that was essentially a stop-and-search operation to prevent contraband cargoes from entering Cuban waters. Several other factors should be borne in mind. Cuba is located a very short distance from the continental United States. Bases and other facilities were already in existence for the staging and maintenance of military units. And, of course, the Cuban quarantine was an action by a cohesive national military force. The ability of the Cuban military forces to retaliate or contest the blockade was quite limited.

A more detailed cost estimate of individual ships and naval aircraft, in conjunction with the overall cost of the Cuban operation, will assist analysis of a South African operation. The figures are annual operating costs of the vessels, including estimates of support by other vessels, and are based on the assumption that the vessels are prepared for sustained combat operations.[5]

Type of vessel	Cost per year	30 days (cost)	120 days (cost)
Carrier	$14 to $17 million (average $15 million)	$1,250,000	$5,000,000
Destroyer	$2 to $3 million (average $2 million)	208,000	832,000
Submarine	$2 to $4 million (average $3 million)	250,000	1,000,000
Attack transport	$2 to $3 million (average $2½ million)	208,000	832,000
Support ship	$2 to $6 million (average $4 million)	333,000	1,332,000
Cruiser	$6 to $10 million (average $8 million)	666,000	2,664,000

Operation costs for naval aircraft including support of and readiness for sustained combat operations are as follows:

Fighter/bomber (jet aircraft) $300,000 to $600,000 per year aircraft (average $450-000)

30-day period $37,500

120-day period $150,000

In Chapter 7 it was estimated that a force of 50 or more warships with 300 aircraft would be needed for blockade purposes. Using the above figures, the following costs would be applicable:

	Time frame and cost	
	30-day	120-day
Type vessel:		
50 warships to include—		
4 aircraft carriers	$5,000,000	$20,000,000
3 cruisers	1,998,000	7,992,000
33 destroyers	6,864,000	27,456,000
10 submarines	2,500,000	10,000,000
Aircraft: 300 aircraft (includes approximately 100 for air blockade)	11,250,000	46,000,000
Total	27,612,000	111,448,000
Total, 6-month naval and air blockade period	165,672,000	

According to one study, $8–10 per day would be required to maintain one United Nations soldier on a day-to-day basis. The same study notes "Moreover, if the Force were committed, its expenses would certainly leap upwards—depending on the location and level of activity—and costs might go as

[1] Estimates used for computation of force costs are individual judgments based upon a variety of sources. They are dependent upon analysis of overall costs and interpolation of results. These estimates are very crude figures which only serve to focus attention upon the problem of costs and to suggest possible ranges of magnitude.

[2] U.S. Congress, House of Representatives (88th Cong.), Subcommittee of Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings, Part 2,* (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1963) p. 254.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *The New York Times,* 23 Oct. 1962.

[5] The cost figures used in the table are consolidations and averages from numerous public sources.

high as double the 'cheapest' figure."[6] The cost (direct and indirect) of maintaining troops of modern armies varies from $15–20 a day per man.

The cost of the military operation in the Congo averaged approximately $10 million a month.[7] Oversimplifying the cost figures and assuming there was an average of 15,000 troops on duty, the cost per day per man averages $20. These Congo costs, it must be recalled, were for a peacekeeping operation. In sustained operations, involving direct combat between military forces (both regular and irregular forces), a certain percentage of casualties and replacements in both men and materiel would have to be expected.

The following cost estimates are based upon a range of figures utilized by Cannon and Jordan, the Congo operation, and published reports of naval and air operations. These cost estimates are for ground troops employed in a type of direct intervention discussed in Chapter 7.

Ground troops	Time frame (days)	Sustained operations		
		$15 per day	$20 per day	$30 per day
30,000 (assault force)	30	13,500,000	18,000,000	27,000,000
60,000 (followup force)	30	27,000,000	36,000,000	54,000,000
3,000 (air assault)	30	1,350,000	1,800,000	2,700,000
Total ground forces, 93,000	30	41,850,000	55,800,000	83,700,000
Total ground forces, 93,000	120	166,400,000	223,200,000	334,800,000

	30-day period[1]
Naval and air units:	
60 warships and 300 aircraft (identical to blockade forces with addition of 10 destroyer-type vessels)	$29,692,000
45 attack transports	9,360,000
30 to 40 support vessels (average 35)	11,655,000
Total naval and air units	50,707,000
Support aircraft:	
200 transport aircraft[2] (direct assault)	990,000
Require 3,000 total flying hours for direct assault and approximately 3,000 total flying hours for 30-day period (30-day support)	990,000
Total support aircraft cost	1,980,000

[1] A 30-day time frame is used here as being the best indicator of costs for the variety of naval vessels involved. It is recognized that types of naval support and aircraft support will change as an operation progresses. It is also recognized that the size and composition of a force have been greatly oversimplified for the purposes of this study.

[2] Cost of transport aircraft is computed from U.S. Congress, House of Representatives (88th Cong.), Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, *Hearings, Part 4*, (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1963), p. 781. This document lists the cost of two typical transport aircraft as follows: C124A—3,270 flying hours for total statistical cost of $1,063,338. This averages to $325 per flying hour; C130E—77 flying hours for a total statistical cost of $26,109. This averages $340 per flying hour. The cost for the computation here is $330 per flying hour.

Thus to mount an entire direct intervention operation would require $94,537,000 for a 30-day period.[8]

There are many variations of the force concept employed for the cost estimates. Furthermore, there is a wide range of cost factors which are highly dependent upon the nature of the operation—the intensity of combat, the reaction of opposing forces, and individual nations' cost requirements. To reiterate, this cost analysis is for one type of force and is based on very crude estimates for purposes of adding another element to the overall appreciation of the effort and resources required to conduct military operations.

Another factor must be borne in mind in considering the significance of the cost analysis. These costs are based upon the assumption that most of the forces would come from a single power, or at least powers that have the capability of mounting an operation and have a certain degree of homogeneity of equipment and requirements. If forces were composed of various smaller national contingents, the costs would greatly increase; a longer build-up period, including training, re-equipping, and base facilities would be required. With a major power or powers supplying troops, naval, and air units, the build-up period would be kept to a minimum and costs reduced.

Casualty estimates

The following are the calculations on which the casualty estimates[9] used in chapter 7 were based:

Assault Period up to 15 days: Total per day, 240 personnel; total 15-day period, 7,200 personnel (a percentage of these personnel would be returned to duty).

Consolidation period 15 to 120 days (after assault period): Total per day, 180 to 360 personnel; total 105-day period, 18,900 to 37,800 personnel (a percentage of these personnel would be returned to duty).

[6] Lt. Col. Charles A. Cannon, Jr., and Lt. Col. Amos A. Jordan, USA, in William R. Frye, *A United Nations Peace Force* (New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1957), p. 167.

[7] Lyman M. Tondel, Jr. (ed.) *Legal Aspects of the United Nations in the Congo*, (New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1963) p. 47.

[8] Based on $15 per man per day.

[9] Department of the Army, *FM 101–10*, Staff Officers Field Manual, Part 1 (Washington, 12 February 1959), pp. 336–338. This publication contains statistics that can be utilized for estimating casualties under various combat conditions. The statistics used for the estimates in his paper are as follows:

Average daily admission rate per 1,000 from all causes

Combat conditions:	*Infantry divisions*
Heavy	8
Average	4
Light	2

The statistics are based on experience gained from World War II and Korea. These estimates will vary based upon intensity of combat, enemy capabilities, training of troops, etc. Consequently they should be used with caution.

WASHINGTON STAR HAILS PISCATAWAY PARK BARGAIN

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star long has been recognized for its outstanding editorial policy on conservation and in this special field the Star speaks with a clear and progressive voice.

Today the Star reiterates its consistent support of the cooperative Federal-private landowner pilot program to save the view from Mount Vernon at Piscataway Park. I applaud the Star's editorial, "Potomac Bargain," for its recognition of how significant a bargain completion of Piscataway Park would be because of the 168 donated scenic easements protecting more than 1,190 acres and the large donations of scenic land to the Government.

I highly recommend the Star's editorial of Tuesday, April 25, 1967, to my colleagues:

POTOMAC BARGAIN

In the absence of a last-minute rescue, the long, carefully developed campaign to preserve the Potomac shoreline across from Mount Vernon as a lovely natural park is apt to be scuttled tomorrow in the House. And if that occurs, Congress will be allowing an extraordinary bargain to slip down the drain.

The threat is created by the House Appropriations Committee's inexplicable failure to recommend a $2.7 million expenditure representing the federal government's modest share in the venture. Two foundations, displaying a good deal more foresight than the committee, have generously offered to contribute 500 acres of the expensive shoreline to the government. About 170 individuals have also agreed to donate scenic easements vital to the conservation. These offers will expire, however, unless Congress this year purchases other strategically necessary portions of the proposed Piscataway Park—at a cost that is only a fraction of the true value.

Representative Machen, who has worked in behalf of the park for more than a year, pledges, if necessary, to carry on the fight in the Senate. The actual decision, however, may well be made in the House. Surely, in voting the massive $1.3 billion Interior appropriation bill, some way can be found to salvage this important item while there still is time.

ARMENIAN MASSACRES OF 1915

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, modern man often points with pride to the social and technical accomplishments achieved through his ingenuity and intelligence, but amid the progress and growth of his material world are many appalling examples of man's inhumanity to man. One of the most horrendous of these shameful acts in the 20th century began in 1915 when the Ottoman Empire of Turkey cruelly annihilated the Armenian population that had lived peacefully in Anatolia for centuries. Genocide of a whole ethnic community is not one of the

modern inventions we should hope to pass on to future generations.

Fearing European intervention on behalf of the subject Armenians, the Ottoman authorities decided to dissolve the problem by destroying the Armenian communities. On April 24, 1915, the first arrests of Armenian leaders took place, thus depriving the Armenians of any leadership that might have rallied them to resist the cruelties to follow. The remainder of the Armenian nation was then subjected to murder, starvation, and dispersal until almost 2,000,000 people had been removed from Turkey. Families were separated, men were assassinated, women were abducted for the pleasure of the Sultan's soldiers, and whole villages were destroyed and their occupants removed to hostile environments where they were left to die of disease and starvation. Before it ended, modern history's first genocide had killed nearly 1,000,000 Armenians and relocated an equal number to foreign lands. In 1 short year, an ancient nation had been virtually decimated to a point close to extinction.

Today, there remain a few Armenian communities in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq in addition to the few survivors in Turkey. Russia proudly boasts of its independent Armenian nation made up from the 1915 survivors who fled northward during the holocaust, but these people have only traded one dictator for another. But the Armenia of 1914, a nation of 2,000,000 people, can never be reconstructed. This nation remains in the hearts of its few scattered people and in the memories of all civilized men who abhor genocide.

On this anniversary of the Armenian massacres, let us remember not only the victims of ruthless murder but also the inhuman hatred that threatens all minorities.

QUOTA PROPOSED FOR FROZEN STRAWBERRIES

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues from the State of Oregon [Mrs. GREEN, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. DELLENBACK] in recommending legislation today to correct a serious agricultural problem which is threatening the health of the domestic strawberry industry. Under the sponsorship of Senators WAYNE MORSE and MARK O. HATFIELD, similar legislation is being presented today in the Senate.

Our bill will impose a quota on imports of processed, prepared, and frozen strawberries. Each year the quota will limit strawberry imports to 20 percent of the average annual consumption in the United States for the preceding 5 years.

The impact of this legislation is not limited to the State of Oregon. Indeed, strawberries are grown commercially in 28 States, and the National Association of Frozen Food Packers has participated in recommending this action.

Strawberry imports have increased dramatically in the last decade. In 1966, there were imports from Colombia, Sweden, The Netherlands, and Poland—but primarily the domestic market was invaded by Mexico.

During the period 1955 to 1959, Mexican exports of frozen strawberries into the United States averaged 13 million pounds annually. From 1960 to 1964, this average rose to 32 million pounds. In 1965, approximately 50 million pounds of frozen Mexican strawberries entered this country. Last year the total reached 82.8 million pounds, for a 60-percent increase in a single year.

There are many reasons for the Mexican success. Labor costs, both in the fields and in processing, are about 10 percent of comparable costs in the Pacific Northwest. Sugar prices are about half the U.S. average, and containers are also cheaper in Mexico. American farmers and processors cannot compete with the cut-rate labor, sugar, materials, and selling prices of the imported product.

The rapid growth of the Mexican strawberry industry may be attributed almost exclusively to expanding exports to the United States. Faced with this competition, it is apparent that the strawberry industry of the United States needs some assurance that its domestic market will not be completely disrupted if it is to remain in business.

The 20-percent formula we have recommended is a reasonable one. The annual average disappearance of frozen strawberries in the United States for the most recent 5-year period is 272.06 million pounds. During this same period, imports of frozen strawberries from Mexico have averaged 44.5 million pounds annually. In the light of these statistics, an annual quota of 50 million pounds—or about 20 percent—would appear to guarantee a significant market for the Mexican product.

Rather than raise duties to extravagant heights, we have chosen instead to adopt the quota approach. The 20-percent formula will enable foreign exporters to share our growing domestic markets, and at the same time prevent rapid domination of those markets to the detriment of American producers and processors. In the event of a declining market situation, the quota approach holds foreign strawberry imports to a reasonable level.

Mr. Speaker, we have attempted to present a bill today which will assist a domestic industry in maintaining its marketplace, without seriously disrupting friendly trade with our neighbors. We are hopeful that the strawberry import quota legislation will accomplish this goal.

RUSSIAN JEWS HELD IN BONDAGE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is very fitting today, as Jews the world over start observance of Passover, that we here take note of the plight of the Jews held in bondage in the Soviet Union. That bondage, while not as physical as that inflicted upon the ancient Jews by the Pharaohs, is every bit as cruel and persistent. The Communists in direct violation of their own constitution have driven Jews from the arts, business, the military, and public life. They have forbidden the printing of sacred books and teachings, thus making it difficult for Jewish fathers to pass on their heritage to their own children.

The current Jewish pogrom in Russia started with Stalin when before the war he purged the Rusisan Army officer corps of Jews. After the war, despite devout and loyal service by thousands of Jews, Stalin continued his vicious campaign. His death did not lessen the tragic circumstances of Russian Jewry as the persecution continued in each succeeding regime.

Tonight as devout Jews open their Passover ceremonies they will not only be marking the freedom of their ancestors from the persecution of the Pharaohs. They will be praying, too, for the deliverance of their brethren in Russia. We, too, must join in those prayers, just as we must speak out against this abomination, this travesty on the fundamental laws of humanity which is taking place in the Soviet Union. It is fitting and proper that Americans of all faiths join together in expressing their indignation at the persecution of the Soviet Jews. In good conscience there is no other course of action.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I introduced, and this body subsequently passed, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion. I would like to quote that resolution—it is still very much the sense of Congress and all America:

That it is the sense of Congress that persecutions of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses and fully permit the free exercise of religion and pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

CRITICAL SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of a momentous decision—whether we should escalate the war another step. It has been officially stated that because of the buildup of enemy forces some steps must be taken to beef up our contingent in South Vietnam. For this reason General Westmoreland has already asked for more troops, and according to reports, which seem to have been well inspired, he wants two divisions more, or about 100,000 men. And this is the decision with which the President is confronted.

Mr. Speaker, some information has come to me which bears on this question, which is before us and before the Nation. And I felt that it was my duty to impart it to my colleagues here, and to the Nation. For it seems appropriate that, on the eve of this tremendous decision, of whether to escalate or not, we should examine carefully the options that are before us.

I have evidence which leads me to believe that one of the factors causing there to be a need for additional troops is the decline in the morale and a serious breakdown in the South Vietnamese Army; and the cause for this is political, not military. It has come to my attention through private Vietnamese sources that there is a desperate power struggle going on in Saigon between Premier Ky and General Thieu. It is aggravating, and perhaps at the bottom of this deterioration in morale. It has particular significance in the sensitive I Corps area around Hue. The struggle between Ky and Thieu involves the Presidency. We should have no quarrel with this development, since it would be a normal process of democracy; except that the fight among the generals seems to have had a chaotic effect upon our military effort.

The chronology of events appears to be as follows: It is reported that sometime last month there was a meeting of the South Vietnamese military, at which time it was decided that General Thieu, not Premier Ky, would be the military's candidate for the Presidency. Premier Ky was angered by this development, his first reaction was to declare that any person intending to stand for the Presidency should not remain in the Army. General Thieu apparently takes the view that withdrawing from the Army would be withdrawing from a power base, and was therefore unwilling to resign. Premier Ky's next move was to form a commission ostensibly to investigate corruption among Army officers, and under this guise proceeded to arrest members of the military who were apparently loyal to General Thieu. General Thieu then formed a counter commission to investigate corruption, and he has also been arresting officers. And thus we have a struggle which has begun to split asunder the South Vietnamese Army and severely affect its morale and efficiency. This has had severe repercussions in the I Corps area. Here is an area which our Marines were so much on top of a year ago that they were able to go off on expeditious of pacification. And that was with even less troops in the area. Recently the U.S. Army has had to rush troops to reenforce the Marines. We have had to evacuate civilians from villages to Hue. And within 2 miles of the American military headquarters at Quang Tri, the Vietcong staged a raid and were able to liberate a great many prisoners. The Vietcong have become immensely successful at their guerrilla tactics. On April 8 it was reported that two South Vietnamese brigades were overrun. According to information passed on to me, these brigades actually surrendered to the enemy because the effect of the political in-fighting has been so bad it destroyed the will of the troops to fight.

Thus we are confronted with a situation in which the South Vietnamese Army is loosing ground, not so much because of the superiority of enemy troops, but because of local demoralization caused by a political struggle. The situation is disastrous. And something must be done to halt this deterioration, and to restore the morale and purpose of the Nationalists.

There is another factor which is impending, which might make matters worse. On the 23d of May there will be a celebration of the birthday of Buddha. All sorts of arrangements are being made for that occasion, and demonstrations by the Buddhists are anticipated. Moreover, the Saigon government has asked for a truce for that day, and possibly an indefinite extension of the truce. I am concerned about the posture from which we would negotiate if there is a deterioration in our position until that date.

Because I think this is a matter of great interest to the Members here, I have invited a certain Vietnamese whose record is impeccable. He was a very popular and effective commander in the I Corps area. He came to international prominence because he brought peace to the area at the time of the Buddhist uprising in Danang and Hue. He was later made to resign by Premier Ky. But he has always been popular with the peasants, and particularly the Buddhists. He also has the confidence of the Marines. His name is Gen. Nguyen Cahn Thi, and I have invited him to Capitol Hill tomorrow at 2:45 in the Speaker's Dining Room to talk with my colleagues about the serious situation that has developed in the I Corps area, the area that he once commanded, in the hope that he might shed some light on the question that is before us.

FARM LABOR POLICY UPHELD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, some of those who insist that American agriculture has suffered in the transition from foreign to domestic farm labor have charged that American farmers are swarming to Mexico where the going is easier.

I think it is significant that the California Farmer, a publication which takes every opportunity to attack the administration's farm labor policy, has published in its March 18 issue an article showing that Mexican agriculture is not harming American farmers and that California growers had better think twice before moving to Mexico.

The carefully researched article quickly states a simple conclusion:

If you can't make a go of farming in California, you'll never strike it rich in Mexico.

Conversations with growers, distributors, and agricultural officials in the Culiacan area of Mexico—the heart of the winter vegetable area—showed that the success of Mexican agriculture depends largely on the success of American crops. If the United States has poor crops, Mexicans come out well; if the United States has good crops, Mexican growers cannot begin to compete.

Besides being handicapped by high shipping costs to get their produce to the United States and low yield per acre, Mexican growers do not enjoy such cheap labor as some would have us believe. The writer points out that it is not unusual for hired hands working in the tomato crop—which accounts for two-thirds of the produce shipped to the United States—to receive $1.75 a day.

I think these facts have deflated yet another argument of critics of America's farm labor policy. Therefore, I would like to insert into the RECORD this article showing that American agriculture is suffering no threat from our neighbor to the south:

MEXICO—LAND OF PROMISE—IF YOU'RE LUCKY

(By Alton Pryor)

You're thinking of moving your farming operation to Mexico?

If so, you might be well-advised to hang onto your homestead until you've surveyed the situation from every angle. In a mere five days' investigation of the Culiacan area of Mexico, where the winter vegetable deal flourishes, *California Farmer* feels it uncovered sufficient information to determine that Mexico doesn't necessarily house the coveted golden egg.

When boiled down to the bare truth, the information we garnered seemed to lead to a simple conclusion: "If you can't make a go of farming in California, you'll never strike it rich in Mexico."

This is not to say that money is not being made in the vegetable industry in Mexico; some growers and distributors have managed highly successful deals, but not, we feel, at the expense of the U.S. industry.

And, for every dollar made, there is very likely one lost, for it is not uncommon for an enthusiastic grower to go south, only to come back with his "tail between his legs," so to speak. It's a risky business and the problems are great.

Certainly, our statement that growers in the U.S. aren't suffering because of Mexican imports is counter to virtually all of the news stories which have circulated in this State. But we feel we can justify the statement, and intend to do so.

This writer interviewed a host of growers, distributors and agricultural association officals, and no matter whom we talked to, our figures always seemed to add up to the same sum: "If the U.S. has a short crop, then there is money in Mexican produce; if the U.S. has a big crop, Mexican growers fall on their faces."

To illustrate this point, let us quote Walter Holm, one of the more successful distributors of Mexican produce in Nogales, Arizona, and also a financial backer of a Mexican growing operation.

"It costs from $2 to $2.25 just to get a lug of tomatoes to the border, and this doesn't include growing costs," Holm said. These costs were verified by every other person and agency we consulted.

Consequently, when growing costs are considered, a grower has to get at least $3.10 for a 3-layer lug of tomatoes to break even.

Angus MacKenzie, a buyer for Coast Marketing Company, which also has a financial arrangement with a Mexican grower, probably put this into proper perspective with this: "The cost per acre of growing in Culiacan is a lot less per acre, but not less per package."

MacKenzie should know whereof he speaks, because his firm also has a tomato operation in San Diego County. While San Diego growers can boast yields of 2000–2500 boxes per acre, he said, growers in Culiacan must

content themselves with 500–600 marketable lugs.

Culiacan growers harvest more than the 500–600 boxes mentioned, but, because of a self-imposed restriction, cannot ship any fruit which grades below 85 per cent U.S. 1.

Even if it weren't necessary to cull so heavily, Mexican growers would not reap the yields that San Diego growers experience. For one thing, as Angus MacKenzie explained, "In Mexico, we're growing in the winter. We have cold nights. The vines can be loaded with blooms and we get three cold nights in a row and they are all knocked off."

There is a reason for the heavy culling other than the restriction of the growers themselves, and this is the distance the fruit must travel to reach its ultimate destination.

There is a 2-day period from the time the fruit is picked until it reaches the border at Nogales and is sold. Fruit which could easily reach a major market in good condition from San Diego, would deteriorate considerably with this added waiting period.

The culled tomatoes aren't a complete loss, as they are sold on the Mexican domestic market, but can hardly be considered a profitable operation. The West Mexico Vegetable Distributors Association at Nogales figures that only 40 percent of the tomatoes harvested meet U.S. No. 1 shipping requirements.

The other 60 per cent, classified as No. 2's and culls, are sold on the domestic market for 8.00 to 12.50 pesos (64 cents to $1.00 U.S. currency). This includes the cost of the crate which is about 32 cents in U.S. money.

Tomatoes account for about two-thirds of the produce volume shipped into the U.S. from Mexico, with cantaloups running second, but considerably lower in number than tomato shipments.

The Mexican crop comes off at the same time Florida is harvesting vegetables, and therein lies the success or failure for growers in Mexico.

If Florida has a good year, it doesn't matter what Mexican growers do. They can't compete. It's when Florida experiences a serious setback, such as a major freeze, that Mexican production comes into play.

And then, this imported production is not grabbing markets from Florida growers. They are merely shipping what Florida is unable to produce. It's a matter of supply and demand.

Labor is plentiful, and compared to American standards, is considered cheap. Even this might be disputed when you consider an operation like Horacio Campana's and his three partners.

Campana said they farm 600 hectares, or the equivalent of 1500 acres. For the 7-month growing season, it is necessary to employ 800 persons. A tractor driver earns 30 pesos a day, while a woman tying tomatoes to poles can make from 20–25 pesos per day. A peso is equivalent to eight cents American.

If you figure that each of these workers puts in 25 days a month, earning an average of $1.75 per day, it doesn't take a mathematician to see that the total labor bill comes to a sizable $245,000 a year, and this is a conservative estimate.

Mexican growers have many problems which U.S. growers don't face, such as acquiring machinery and parts (and at exorbitant prices), added freight and export duties just to get the produce into the U.S., and difficulty in acquiring packing materials.

All of these things will be explored in future installments.

At the same time, we do not want to underrate the tremendous potential of the west coast of Mexico as a supplier of vegetables.

Certainly the potential is there and should, we feel, be explored. As Carlos Brennen, who operates a packing house and works with a Mexican growing operation, said, "Mexico has the potential to feed the entire North American continent." But certainly this is not an overnight development.

While the importing of fruits and vegetables from Mexico might appear to be a one-way street, nothing could be further from the truth.

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, in 1964, Mexico bought $1,023,000,000 worth of goods from the United States. During the same year, Mexican sales to the U.S. were $600,000,000.

In our next installment, we will take a closer look at a Mexican growing operation, detailing some of the problems we mentioned previously. In future installments, we will concentrate on some of the costs involved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MAILLIARD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the period April 24 through April 27, on account of official business.

Mr. ROYBAL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), from April 20, 1967, through April 28, 1967, inclusive, on account of official business (attendance at the second session of the Latin-American Interparliamentary Conference in Montevideo, Uruguay).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHADEBERG, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, April 26; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. BUTTON), for 30 minutes, on April 25; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. BUTTON), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WOLFF, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BUTTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 25, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

680. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations for the fiscal year 1968 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 111); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

681. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances to members of the uniformed services authorized leave from isolated posts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

682. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 79–520; to the Committee on Armed Services.

683. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia for the month of March 1967, pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1967 and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

684. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of procurement of critically needed missile fuel under adverse conditions from a sole-source supplier, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

685. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of air transportation provided dependent children of Department of Defense personnel between the continental United States and overseas areas, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

686. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

687. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the determinations relating to the rearrangement and equalization of the construction repayment due the United States from the various irrigation contractors for their respective shares of the costs of the water storage works on the Milk River project in northern Montana, pursuant to the provisions of 73 Stat 584; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

688. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit tacking citizen ownership of vessels for trade-in purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

689. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 510(a)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

690. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 6, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Soquel Creek, Santa Cruz,

Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved July 3, 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 20, 1967, the following bill was reported on April 21, 1967:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington; Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9029. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 24, 1967*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on manpower utilization at military installations in Far Eastern and Western European countries (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: committee of conference. S. 303. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 208). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6133. A bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3631. A bill to provide for the dedication of certain streets on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation and to convey title to certain plated streets, alleys, and strips of land (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 20, 1967, the following bill was introduced on April 21, 1967:

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 9029. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

[*Submitted April 24, 1967*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9030. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 9031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 9032. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9033. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9034. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 9035. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Diplomatic Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 9036. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent across-the-board benefit increase, with subsequent cost-of-living increases, and to increase the amount an individual is permitted to earn without loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 9037. A bill to provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9038. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 9039. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 9040. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 9041. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 9042. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9043. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 9044. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expended job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 9045. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 9046. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9047. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9048. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9049. A bill to amend section 3 of title 4 of the United States Code to prohibit the mutilation of the flag anywhere in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9050. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9051. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the leasing by local governmental units of certain industrial and commercial facilities for private profitmaking purposes at rentals below their fair rental value; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 9053. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9055. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9056. A bill to provide for financing the construction of public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9057. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to construct, operate, and maintain a parking facility in Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 9058. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9059. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide that employer contributions do not have to be made under that act with respect to service performed in the employ of certain public international organizations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 9060. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9061. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9062. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require certain agencies of the United States to obtain authorization from the Secretary of the Inte-

rior before undertaking geological and geophysical explorations in the Outer Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY (by request):

H.R. 9063. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 9064. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9065. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9066. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to increase the amount of the annual appropriations authorized thereunder for grants for basic water and sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9067. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportion of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional deduction with respect to a student for whom a personal exemption is allowed the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 9069. A bill to amend section 140a of title 10, United States Code, relating to adjustments of retired pay and retainer pay of members and former members of the Armed Forces to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9070. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9071. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITENER (by request):

H.R. 9072. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease airspace above and below freeway rights-of-way within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 9073. A bill to impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 528. Joint resolution requesting the Department of Defense to use butter in its rations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POOL:

H.J. Res. 529. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a National Letter Carriers Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Res. 448. Resolution extending the commendation of the House of Representatives to Keep America Beautiful, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 449. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

152. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

153. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, relative to the reading of the Holy Bible and public prayer in our public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

154. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring Walt Disney; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

155. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to the status of Guam as a true part of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

156. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to amending the Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

157. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to preventing the interstate Pecatonica River from flooding annually in the plains of southwestern Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9074. A bill for the relief of Kaneaki Kamei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9075. A bill for the relief of Mr. Sassanvash Haghighi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9076. A bill for the relief of Gertrudes Cabagungan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9077. A bill for the relief of Joan Caponong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9078. A bill for the relief of Eufrosina Garrido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9079. A bill for the relief of Conchita Tan Orgiles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9080. A bill for the relief of Federico de la Cruz-Monz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9081. A bill for the relief of Dr. Josefina Esther Kouri-Barreto de Pelleya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9082. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl C. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9083. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ioannis Koumbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9084. A bill for the relief of Pablo Gregorich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 9085. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9086. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9087. A bill for the relief of Matyas Hunyadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9088. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Fuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 9089. A bill for the relief of E. Christian Des Marets, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9090. A bill for the relief of Yoichiro Matsumura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9091. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Weckman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9092. A bill for the relief of Maria Adelaide Soares Aguiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9093. A bill for the relief of Julio Low; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9094. A bill for the relief of Georgios Andreas Minakakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

69. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to a change of format in printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Father of us all, we begin another day, another week in this Chamber of high office, seeking Thy guidance.

We are grateful for the faithfulness and sincere work of these Members of the Senate of the United States who seek to be good leaders of the people. The many tasks, the sacrificial time, the important small acts of office consistently conducted do not reach the headlines. But, they serve mankind and Thee. Bless these leaders in all of their work.

We continue to pray for the peace which seems not to be part of our understanding at this moment of history. Give to our President, his advisers, and all leaders the insight to find the way for peace in Vietnam. Be with those who suffer and die in this conflict even today.

Enlighten with Thy spirit this day all people of responsibility. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the